

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, November, 1890.

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF "THE BODY AND THE SOUL": POEMS IN ENGLISH.

There are few more characteristic embodiments of the religious spirit of the Middle Ages than that found in the large class of poems produced throughout the whole of this period in almost every country and language of Europe, which, in the form of an address of a soul to its body or of a dialogue between soul and body, purported to exhibit the soul's feelings of gratitude or resentment towards the body, whether at the moment when their long comradeship is about to be dissolved, or after their separation has taken place. Of these two situations, one may say that it lay in the nature of things that the more tragical (that of the resentful soul) should exert the greater attraction. So decided, indeed, as a matter of fact, is the preponderance, both in point of number and importance, of the poems which deal with that situation, that Prof. WÜLCKER ('Grundriss,' p. 233) has been led to accept the Vercelli Fragment (GREIN i, 203 f.) as a unique example of the opposite class—not only as regards English literature but as regards foreign literatures as well. There is here, however, a misstatement of the case in both clauses, inasmuch as the title of *Dichtung* can hardly be denied to the passage in MORRIS 'O. E. Homilies' II. 183, pointed out by VARNHAGEN, as it certainly cannot be denied to the very attractive German poem in dialogue form, edited by RIEGER (*Germania* iii, 405 ff.) from a Basel MS. of the end of the thirteenth century. It would seem probable, moreover, from the passage in the *Revue Celtique* for October, 1889, p. 470, that an address of a blessed soul to its body may be found in the "Sermon on Death" in Prof. ROBERT ATKINSON's "Passions and Homilies of the Leabhar Breac," London, 1887. That work is inaccessible to me, however, and the suggestion remains to be verified.

But after all additions are made to the number of poems in which it is a blessed soul that

speaks, we still perceive that here, as in the case of the 'Divine Comedy,' the profounder interest resides in the tragical situation, and I shall therefore confine my attention in the following discussion to the poems which relate to this branch of the general subject.

The whole body of poems, then, which turn upon the fate of a condemned soul may be divided into two classes, on the basis of an obvious difference in form already alluded to.

1. Those in which the soul addresses the body, upbraiding it for its sins during their united existence on earth and for the misery which this conduct entails upon both after death, the body, however, remaining silent.

This class of poems may be designated simply "Address of a damned soul to its body," and as chief representative of the class we may take the Old English poem, GREIN i, 198 ff.

2. Those in which the body replies and to which alone the title of dialogue is properly applicable. As chief representative of this class we may take the "Dialogus inter corpus et animam" or "Visio Fulberti" or "Philberti." Edited among others by THOMAS WRIGHT ('Latin Poems commonly attributed to Walter Mapes,' London, 1841, p. 95 ff.), and from better MSS. by E. DU MÉRIL ('Poésies populaires latines antérieures au douzième siècle,' Paris, 1843, p. 217 ff.).

Now, the two classes of poems distinguished above, although different in the respects to which reference has been made, have no doubt, as Prof. VARNHAGEN, the chief investigator in this field, remarks, *Anglia* ii, 226, a historical connection. The difference, indeed, is mainly one of form, for not only is the didactic end identical in both, but the content, although employed under different forms, is in a very large measure the same in each instance. In the absence of external evidence, the question as to the exact order of development presents, of course, great difficulties. I do not think, however, that we can regard as an accident the fact that the English and French versions preserved to us show with increasing antiquity an increasing simplicity of structure. Thus, for the English, compare

the Old English address (GREIN i, 198 ff.) with the PHILLIPPS "Fragment" ("Fr."), the "Visio Philberti" and the poems based on the "Visio," and, for the French, compare "Un Samedi par Nuit" with the poem edited by STENGEL, *Zs. f. rom. Ph.* iv, 75 ff., and the other later French versions.

Of course, if we accept the view that the order of development was from the form of the address to that of the dialogue, this relation would not at all preclude the possibility that the simpler form was cultivated alongside of that which was later in its origin and more complicated in its structure. As a matter of fact, we know that the form of the address continued to exist by the side of that of the dialogue. Such a proof is furnished by the address of the soul to the body contained in one of the Religious Songs first edited by THOMAS WRIGHT ("Publications of the Percy Society," xi, 70 ff.), and by RICHARD MORRIS ('O. E. Miscellany,' 168 ff.), under the title of "Death"—the song in question belonging to the thirteenth century, when the "Visio," even if it was not itself an English production, must have been known in England.

In any case, the question of the relation between the two forms is unaffected by Prof. VARNHAGEN's recent interesting discovery ("Erlanger Beiträge zur englischen Philologie," Heft. i, Erlangen und Leipzig, 1890, p. 1 ff.) of a passage in the 'Talmud,' until a connection has been established between that passage and the poems produced in Western Europe with which we are now dealing. As the matter stands, the words of the Roman emperor only represent the attitude of mind from which the dialogue poems eventually sprang.

But let us consider more nearly the question of the origin of the various versions and the chronological order of their composition.

Of all poems on the subject, the Old English "Address of the Damned Soul to its Body," as found in the Exeter and Vercelli Books, is transmitted to us in much the oldest form. Portions of this poem were first printed by J. J. CONYBEARE in 1812 (*Archæologia* xvii, 189 ff.). B. THORPE (1836) first edited the poems according to the text of the Vercelli Book in his "Appendix C, to Mr. Cooper's

Report," p. 93 ff.—again, using both the Exeter and Vercelli Books, in his 'Codex Exoniensis' (1842), 367 ff. For the rest of the bibliography of this "Address," see WÜLCKER, 'Grundriss' iii, 182.

Now, concerning the origin of this poem, though external proofs of the fact are altogether wanting, all writers of authority on the subject from RIEGER (*Germania* iii, 396 ff.) to GASTON PARIS (*Romania* ix, 311 ff.) and EBERT ('Geschichte' iii, 89 ff.), regard the "Address of the Damned Soul" as imitated from a Latin original, whether this original was to be found in a homily, as EBERT surmises, or in a poetical form. It is true that THORPE, the first editor of the complete text, makes the following observation, 'Codex Exoniensis,' p. 525: "The original of the present poem is a prose homily to be found in most of the MSS. (of which a Latin original, no doubt, exists)," but it has never been ascertained to what MS. THORPE refers in this passage. Most probably he only records a vague and inaccurate impression.

In attempting to fix more definitely this Latin original, which he takes, on the other hand, to be the original also of the later treatments of the subject in Latin and French, GASTON PARIS (*Romania* ix, 312), points to a very singular passage in the rimed French version of the legend of St. Alexius, a version dating from the end of the thirteenth century and the neighborhood of Lille. In this passage, embracing lines 211-243 (p. 285 ff. of his edition of the St. Alexius legends), he sees a trace of the original Latin legend which stands at the head of all subsequent treatments of the subject—whether in Old English, French, Latin or what not. The import of the passage is as follows:

When St. Alexius, after the wedding, is brought to the bridal chamber and is left alone with his bride, he begins straightway to preach to her, exhorting her passionately to turn aside from the carnal life and make herself a bride for Christ. He enforces his exhortations in the following words—extremely curious, in view of the situation. (The use of the preterite here is worthy of note, as being intelligible only on the supposition that the lines before us are a fragment of a larger whole.)

"Tantost con l'arme ist de chel cors puant,
 Ki n'ama onkes ne Diu ne sen cornant,
 Mais de mal faire se fist fort et poissant,
 Si vinrent lues mil diable acorant
 Ki l'encauchierent trestot vers le torment
 Ou li vier sont et li sierpent mordant.
 Coi k'il en fachent, chou trovons nos lisant.
 Au samedi anchois le coc contant
 Revient droit l'arme a la fosse criant,
 Le puant cors mont forment maudisant
 Ki l'a conduite en chel torment si grant.
 He cors, dist l'arme, mar te vi onkes net;
 Mau soit de l'heure ke fumes ajostet,
 Et maudet soient de sainte trinitet
 Andoi li piet ki chou ont poralet,
 Et les deus mains ki ont chou manovret,
 Et ichil cuers ki chou a porpenset,
 Aussi li boce ki chou a porparlet,
 Et li doi uel ki chou ont rewardet
 Et les oreilles ki chou ont escoutet
 Dont li mien membre sont si grief tormentet!
 Or giras, cors, en le tiere enfermee,
 Et jou irai come maleuree
 A le dolor ke tu m'as porparlee
 Dusk'au juise
 Kant te cars ert de mort resuschitee,
 Et en l'act de trente ans restoree,
 Od toi ensemble en le flame embrasee
 Ke li diable nos aront aprestee;
 Pius comparras l'orgueil et le possee
 Ke tu tos jors as si grant demenee."

With reference to this passage, GASTON PARIS (*Romania* ix, 312) remarks as follows:

"L'âme est ici [in the Alexius fragment] seule à parler, comme dans les anciens poèmes Anglo-Saxons; Elle revient de l'enfer pour visiter son corps comme dans ces poèmes et dans la Visio Philberti; son retour a lieu dans la nuit du samedi au dimanche comme dans le poème français. Des éléments particuliers à chacune des versions postérieures se trouvent donc réunis ici, et la légende sur laquelle s'appuient ces vers (non mentionnés par M. Kleinert) peut être la base de toutes ces versions."

It would seem quite as probable, however, that a poem uniting these various elements should have borrowed them in part, at least, from various sources, as that it should have received them all together from a single ancient source, whence they had made their way only partially into all subsequent redactions but this. We know that such borrowing from the Old French poem "Un Samedi par Nuit" did take place in the case of the Middle English "Als y lay in a winters night" (W. LINOW's dissertation: "þe Desputisoun bi-

twen þe Bodí and þe Soule," published as No. 1 of the "Erlanger Beiträge zur englischen Philologie," p. 10 ff.), although the main source of that poem is the "Visio."

From these considerations, I see no ground for assigning to this fragment so exceptional a position among all poems on the subject as that of the one reflecting most accurately the source from which they all sprang.

A second attempt to find a definite clue to the original of the Old English "Address of the Damned Soul to the Body," as of all poems on this subject—though the results, perhaps, are as little acceptable—is equally interesting with that of GASTON PARIS, because striking out in a totally unexpected direction. I refer to an article in the *Revue Celtique* for October, 1889, p. 463 ff., by H. GAIDOUZ. In this article GAIDOUZ endeavors to trace all poems on the subject, including the Old English poem, back to a Latin prototype of Irish origin. The author is led to this view of the matter by a piece in the ancient Irish language found in the famous monument of that language known under its Irish title of the 'Leabhar Breac.' This piece was edited by Prof. ROBERT ATKINSON in the work already referred to, and contains a dialogue between body and soul. The 'Leabhar Breac' is set by WINDISCH ('Kurzgefasste irische Grammatik,' Vorrede, p. vi), somewhat later than the 'Book of Leinster,' which belongs to the middle of the twelfth century.

The theory of GAIDOUZ is that the literature of the "Debates between Body and Soul" sprang originally from the general literature of visions, and, to use his own words, "before becoming a subject by itself the dialogue between body and soul was only an incident in the general recital of a vision" (p. 464). The value of the Irish "Sermon on Death" (as D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE designates the piece above-mentioned, see *Revue Celtique* for January, 1888, p. 129), lies, then, as he thinks, in the evidence which it furnishes of this translation. The Irish, according to this hypothesis, gives us the earliest form of treatment, and the theme passed, through the agency of Irish monks, among the Anglo-Saxons.

As circumstances rendered Prof. ATKIN-

SON's work inaccessible to me (a copy is in the possession of the Astor Library at New York), in order to obtain a notion of the "Sermon on Death" I have been compelled to content myself with the Latin skeleton of that version published by GAIDOUZ in the article referred to above—this skeleton being made up, as it seems, of the Latin sentences with which each important section of the frame-work of the whole and of the actual dialogue is introduced.

According to this outline in Latin, the soul, after the body has ceased to perform its functions, perceiving that something is wrong, as much from the interruption of the body's usual sinful occupations as from the stopping of breath, the oppression of the heart, the pallor of the lips and the dropping of the teeth, runs in alarm to the gates of each of the senses respectively, to the lips, nostrils, eyes and ears, but is met everywhere by Death, who forbids it to proceed further.¹ Therefore it flies to the top of the head, stands on the tip-top (as the author has it), looks around in wonder, and asks :

"Quid est istud pallium quod tenui circa me? non meum est hoc vestimentum neque de vestimentis meis in candidate prius apparui. Quis comotavit vestem meam?"

The devil then speaks against the soul and accuses it, saying :

"O anima infelix, respice nos,
A nobis tibi est vestimentum,
Quia Adam circa se prius tenuit et
Cain circa se tenuit et Judas Iscariot
Circa se tenuit et Coephas princeps
Sacerdotum circa se tenuit vestimentum illud."

Further on the devils say :

"O anima infelix, respice corpus tuum et domum tuam unde existi."

Then the soul expresses repentance for its sins, strives to go upwards to the heavens, but is prevented by the devils. Afterwards the soul returns to the body and begins to inveigh against it, to which the body rejoins.

There are certain considerations, I think, which tell against the theory of GAIDOUZ that this version, partaking of the nature both of a vision and of a dialogue between body and

¹. The passage thus far has a curious parallel in the well-known eighteenth century poem, "The Grave" by ROBERT BLAIR.

soul, was the prototype of the Old English "Address of the Damned Soul to its Body."

In the first place, as has been already observed, the weight of evidence concerning the relations of the dialogue and monologue forms, is rather in favor of the greater antiquity of the latter. Such, I may remark, is the tacit assumption of GASTON PARIS (*Romania* ix, 312) when he sets the intercalation of the Alexius poem at the head of all poems on the subject. Similarly RIEGER (*Germania* iii, 399), when he endeavors to explain how the "Visio" was evolved out of the form represented by the Old English "Address." But if GAIDOUZ is right in his supposition that the literature of the Debates sprang incidentally from that of Visions, and that the Irish piece we have before us represents the process of transition, we should have here, in the very inception of the literature of our subject, the dialogue form—and to account for the Old English poem (the prototype of which he expressly says, as well as of the "Visio," is represented by this Irish document) we should have to suppose a reversed development, as it were, from the dialogue form to that of the address. But leaving this unsettled question aside, it still appears to me just as likely that in the Irish document we have simply a debate grafted on a vision—the more so, as in the rimed "Alexius" of GASTON PARIS we have already an example of such a grafting upon the literature of legends. The rôle, too, which the devils play in this piece does not accord with the notion of high relative antiquity, to judge from a comparison of those versions the period of whose composition has been tolerably well established.

I may mention, moreover, that before the appearance of GAIDOUZ's article in the same *Revue Celtique* for January, 1888, p. 128, D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE, reviewing ATKINSON's work, speaks of the group of sermons in which this dialogue is found as imitations from continental originals, without however, as it would seem, stating the reasons for his opinion. He repeats this opinion in the *Revue Celtique* for April, 1888, p. 297.

To finish with the question of the ultimate origin of the Old English "Address," and hence of all poems relating to this subject, I

shall merely call attention to EBERT's remarks ('Geschichte' iii, 89 ff.) with regard to certain theological conceptions which the poems in GREIN betray, that would seem to point to an Old English origin; for instance, the notion that each soul comes as a fresh creation from God, and the conception of the abode of the soul before the last judgment as being Hell and not a place between Hell and Heaven.

The next stage in the poetical development of the conflict between body and soul which we find represented in English literature is seen in the poem published by Sir THOMAS PHILLIPPS from a number of loose parchment leaves which had been used for binding other books, discovered in Worcester Cathedral ('Fragment of Ælfric's Grammar, Ælfric's Glossary and a poem on the Soul and Body in the Orthographic of the twelfth century,' London, 1838). Prof. NAPIER, the last scholar who has examined these leaves, is inclined to assign them, more definitely than PHILLIPPS, to the end of the twelfth century. (*Academy*, Feb. 22d, 1890, p. 134.) A reprint was published by S. W. SINGER (London, 1845), and the poem under the name of the Phillipps or Worcester Fragment, has been re-edited successively by E. HAUFFE ("Fragmente der Rede," etc., Greifswald dissertation, 1880), and R. BUCHHOLZ ('Fragmente der Reden, etc. in zwei Hs. zu Worcester und Oxford,' "Erlanger Beiträge zur engl. Phil.," Heft vi, 1890).

The nature of the relation which this fragment, also a simple address or series of addresses, of the soul to the body, bears to the poem of the Exeter and Vercelli Books, has not yet been defined. KLEINERT ('Über den Streit zwischen Leib und Seele,' Halle dissertation, 1880), undertakes to establish a more or less direct relation between them, but VARNHAGEN (*Anglia* iii, 572 ff.) rejects the arguments adduced to support this hypothesis, and the editors of the "Fr." have been cautious as to expressing themselves in exact terms touching the question. KLEINERT's dissertation was unfortunately not accessible to me.

It may be remarked here once for all that the same uncertainty at present exists concerning the relations of all these poems to one

another down to the "Visio," which, popularizing the theme throughout Europe, became the prototype in every European language of a vast group of poems bearing on their very face the evidence of partial imitation, at least, of this original.

Closely allied to the "Fr." and coinciding with it in whole lines, is the poem known under the title of "The Grave," which was first edited by CONYBEARE from the Oxford MS. *Archæologia* xvii, 174 ff., and since then repeatedly; in most accessible form by SCHRÖER (*Anglia* v, 289 ff.) and by BUCHHOLZ. The relation between these two poems, the "Fr." and "The Grave," is so close as to have even led to the improbable suggestion that "The Grave," itself a fragment, was a part of the "Fr." Taken as a whole, this latter poem is already so confused and formless that such an addition would hardly do prejudice to its claims to artistic merit. In any event, the two poems, compared with others on the subject, may be regarded as constituting a separate group within the monologue poems. As the final representative of this group I should add to "The Grave" and the "Fr." the version contained in one of the Religious Songs edited by THOS. WRIGHT (Percy Society xi, 70 ff.) and last by R. MORRIS ('O. E. Miscellany,' p. 168 ff.) under the title of "Death," this song belonging to the thirteenth century. Although the relation has not been mentioned by VARNHAGEN, I think it is plain that the monologue in "Death" belongs to the same group as the "Fr." and "The Grave." Both in the introduction and the soul's address it bears a strong resemblance to the "Fr." although towards the close, in the introduction and painting of the devil, it would seem to show the influence of a conception which was at work in the dialogue poems. The parallelism in the sequence of ideas which the following table shows is unmistakable, and the inference to be drawn, I think, inevitable. Of course, owing to the difference of literary form between the two poems, no exact coincidence of expression is to be expected. My references are to the Cotton MS. of "Death" published by MORRIS, and to BUCHHOLZ's edition of the "Phillipps Fragment."

Introduction in "Death" = "Fr." A.

I.	Opening of the two poems in which the circumstances of our birth are connected with those of our death.	
	"Death"	"Fr." A.
	17-44	5-10. So 24 ff.
II.	Mourning of the soul in the hour of death.	
	"Death"	"Fr." A.
	45-48	11-16
III.	Failure of the powers and faculties of the animate body.	
	"Death"	"Fr." A.
	49-56	17-23
IV.	Pangs of the separation.	
	"Death"	"Fr." A.
	56-64	27-30
V.	Shrouding of the corpse and desertion of friends.	
	"Death"	"Fr." A.
	65-80	37-43
VI.	"Sorie Cheere" of the soul in addressing the body.	
	"Death"	"Fr." A.
	81 f.	46.

In the address of the Soul, "Death," 89 ff., has its parallel in "Fr." C. 256, and the trait of the body's being thrust out of its former possessions which occurs "Fr." B. 14-16 is deferred to the conclusion of the passage in "Death," viz., 133-136; but for the rest, the picture of the body's desolation (cf. the rhetorical interrogatives, 97 ff.), the accusation that the body has brought both itself and the soul to perdition, the reproach for not having made offerings to the church or sought the services of its priests, are presented in the same order in the two pieces, *i. e.*, "Death," 97-132 corresponds to "Fr." B. 5-34. So the description of the grave as the house of the dead body, with the body's decay, and the consequent desertion of its relatives and division of its apparel. Compare "Death," 145-176 in which the chief traits scattered throughout the "Fr.," are brought together at that point of the poem where the conception first comes up. Thus "Death" 145-176 corresponds to "Fr." B. 37-41 and "Fr." C. 27-50.

The lines 185-192 are of a general character, "All that I hated seemed good to thee," but from l. 193 on, in the description of the devil and of the torments to which the soul is

subjected, the poem of "Death" diverges from the "Fr."

The fragmentary poem first edited by WRIGHT from a Cambridge MS. now lost (Coll. Trin. B. 14, 39), in 'Latin Poems commonly attributed to Walter Mapes,' p. 322, and of which a reconstructed text is given by VARNHAGEN (*Anglia* iii, 577) is too mutilated to furnish the basis for a judgment as to its position among these versions. The parts preserved, however, appear to show a tendency similar to that of corresponding portions of the "Fr."

Taking the "Fr." as the chief representative of what I should like to call the second group of the monologue poems, *i. e.*, standing on a later stage of development, it becomes a question of interest to determine what is its general relation to the group going before, represented by the Old English "Address" of the Exeter and Vercelli Books, and to the second class—the class cast in dialogue form.

It becomes clear, after a closer examination of the "Fr.," that although we may find here the *motifs* employed in the Old English poem, we find these same motives treated in a different fashion, indicating a more advanced stage of development. Not only have the simple hints, the conceptions in their simplest form of the Old English poem, been expanded in the "Fr.," but they have been expanded in a noticeable manner; the expansions have taken on a more rhetorical and pictorial, here and there even satirical character. In contrast to the stern directness of the Old English "Address," we find the poet illustrating what were general hints there by specific pictures, and lingering over the details of his illustrations. For instance, where we have in lines 52 ff. of the "Address" simply, "Nor art thou dearer than the black raven to any living man as a companion, neither to thy mother nor thy father nor any relative," in the "Fr." we have our attention called to the manner in which these relatives actually comport themselves when life in the body is extinct. Thus "Fr." B. 10 ff.: "Where be they who should sit sorry over thee and pray earnestly that aid should come to thee? To them it seemed that thou hadst been alive too long already, they were greedy to lay hands upon thy pos-

sessions. They divide them now between them; they will put thee outside and now they are ready to bear thee out of the house—out of the door. Thou art bereft of thy goods."

And earlier, in "Fr." A. 38 ff., those whom the sinner had benefited are represented as being unwilling even to turn the head of the dead right—"for the rich wife (*i. e.*, the wife of the sinner) scorneth misfortune, for a miserable thing is wretched love"; cf. also B. 38 ff.; C. 33 ff., etc.

Similarly, for the lines 57 ff. of the Old English "Address," "Nor may thy scarlet ornaments nor thy gold nor thy silver nor any of the valuable things thou didst own fetch thee hence," the "Fr." points more distinctly to the manner in which he came by these things; cf. E, 18 ff.; G, 11 ff.

In a similar spirit is the conception of the body as having to lie in bed late after church hours, and the idea of its refusal to take the poor under shelter or to assist them, sitting rather on its bench supported by pillows and throwing knee over knee (C. 25 ff.).

With the tendencies of style I have noted above, these *motifs* were peculiarly adapted, among those employed by the Old English "Address," for expansion in the "Fr." These are, however, but illustrations of characteristics discernible throughout. Everywhere the motives which appear in the "Address" are elaborated here with greater regard to the interest which each one has in itself, apart from its bearing on the whole. In accord with these tendencies is the extensive use of the rhetorical interrogative (cf. B, 4 ff.).

Whilst considering the question of *motifs* employed both in the "Fr." and the Old English "Address," regard should be had to the fact that the conception of the two poems is different as to the time when the soul addresses the body. The Old English poem illustrates the superstition that every sennight the soul returned to upbraid the body, but there is no allusion to such a journey in the "Fr.," so that there, as in the "Un Samedi par Nuit" and in the passage in the homily "De Sancto Andrea" (MORRIS, 'O. E. Homilies' ii, 183), the soul is conceived as directing its invectives against the body immediately after having issued from it. Of course, then, passages of

the Old English poem relating to this journey of the soul will not be represented by corresponding passages of the "Fr." With this restriction, it is clear, I think, that whatever view we may take of the actual relation between the Old English "Address" and the "Fr.," the motives which form the substance of the former may be found also in the latter.

The expansion of motives in the spirit indicated forms the first point of difference between the addresses of the soul in the "Fr." and the Old English "Address."

There is, however, a second point of difference, consisting in the addition of certain characteristic new motives of which there is no trace in the Old English poem. They are substantially three in number.

1. The conception of the grave as the house of the dead body. Cf. B, 40; C, 29 ff.; E, 8.

2. The conception of the body as that of a man who had acquired his great possessions by rendering unjust judgments. Cf. E, 19 ff.; C, 9 ff.; G, 18.

3. The notion that one of the most prominent sins of the body was its neglect of duties towards the church, a notion quite as strongly developed in the poem "Death." Cf. B, 20 ff.; E, 26 ff. In these passages the clerical tendency is apparent likewise in the long passage concerning baptism. E, 29 ff.

In considering the additional motives I have, of course, disregarded unessential similes, however detailed, cf. F, 20 ff.

Now, to give an answer to the question which was put at the beginning of the discussion of what I have called the second group of the monologue poems, as to the general relation of this group to the one preceding, represented by the Old English "Address of the Damned Soul to its Body," and to the poems of the second class (the dialogue poems), represented by the "Visio," it will be evident on a comparison that, although cast in the same form as the Old English poem, the "Fr." in its rhetorical spirit and its elaborate treatment of motives, with here and there satirical touches, stands very close to the dialogue poems. For example, in describing the conduct of family and relatives and in the rhetorical declamation characterising the body's desolation, the spirit of elaboration referred

to is the same here as in the "Visio" and in the "Un Samedi par Nuit." Furthermore, such distinctive conceptions as the first two additional motives which I have pointed out in the "Fr." are repeated in the "Visio," so that, with regard to the accusations of the soul in the "Visio," there is a close parallelism of ideas between these two poems, only the mode of expression in the latter is more compressed and elegant. The transition, then, is easy to the versions of the second class, viz., those in the dialogue form.

In this class the version of incomparably greatest influence is the Latin poem already often referred to as the "Visio" (E. DU MÉRIL 'Poésies populaires latines antérieures au douzième siècle,' p. 217 ff.). Even the country to which the origin of this famous poem is to be assigned remains still doubtful. Cf. VARNHAGEN, *Anglia* iii, 574 f. and GASTON PARIS, *Romania* ix, 312 f. The arguments in the latter passage are little convincing, however, inasmuch as the introductory stanzas on which they are based may well have been added later to give an air of authority to the vision. Cf. G. PARIS, 'Litt. fr. au moyen-âge,' §155. I shall also pass over the attempts of RIEGER (*Germania* iii, 399) and others, to connect this poem with the Old English "Address"—discussions which, at best, end in no convincing conclusions—and shall only briefly follow the traces of its influence. Prof. VARNHAGEN (*Anglia* ii, 225), is inclined to regard the "Visio" as the original directly or indirectly of all poems whatever preserved in the dialogue form. There is good reason, however, to accept the validity of a restriction which GASTON PARIS (*Romania* ix, 312), has made to this statement in favor of the poem "Un Samedi par Nuit" (VARNHAGEN's edition, "Erlanger Beiträge zur engl. Philologie," Heft i, pp. 120 ff.), and consequently of the versions dependent on it. (For the original dialect of the "Un Samedi par Nuit" see GASTON PARIS, *Romania* ix, 313 and P. MEYER *ibid.*, vii, 465). The reason of GASTON PARIS' exception of the "Un Samedi par Nuit" from the list of imitations of the "Visio" is that the metrical form of the "Visio"—Latin rimed quatrains—does not appear at all before the last third of the twelfth century, and even then seems to

have been used first in secular verse before becoming common for poems of a religious import. The Old French poem, on the other hand, belongs unmistakably, he thinks, to the early twelfth century. This is, also, the opinion of SUCHIER, see 'Vie de Saint Auban,' and "Reimpredigt xxxvii" (quoted by LINOW, p. 13). It may be remarked, besides, that the French poem represents, at least, a less advanced form in the poetical development of the subject, for whereas the author of the "Visio" informs his subject with a high degree of dramatic force and with great rapidity of movement, the "Un Samedi par Nuit" gives us only the alternating charges and counter-charges of soul and body, one speech each (see VARNHAGEN's edition), finely colored with passion, it is true. In the dialogue of the "Visio" the speeches of the disputants bear, as it were, towards a point of culmination, becoming shorter and shorter as the fatal moment draws nigh when the devils are to hurry back their victim to the place of torment, and the mutual recriminations of soul and body rise finally into united shrieks of lamentation, before their common danger.

The "Visio," as already noted, spread far and wide throughout Europe, so that imitations even in Icelandic, Polish and Mediæval Greek are known to exist. It is unnecessary to follow here the innumerable versions produced in the chief languages of the continent. The influence of the "Visio" was felt also in England, where the subject had been already so fruitful. If we have to except No. 7 of Prof. VARNHAGEN's list of English Versions in *Anglia* ii, 226 ff. (viz., the dialogue edited last by K. BÖDDEKER, 'Altenglische Dichtungen des Ms. Harl. 2253,' p. 235 ff.), from the influence of the "Visio," since this seems to go back to the Old French version which was composed, as we have seen, earlier than the "Visio," there still remain two Middle English versions, No. 6 and No. 9 of that list, based upon the Latin poem. The first of these versions (No. 6) has recently found two distinguished imitators in Sir THEODORE MARTIN (see the poem of "The Monk's Dream," in 'The Song of the Bell and other Translations,' Edinburgh, 1889, reprinted by VARNHAGEN in LINOW's dissertation, p. 200 ff.), and in Prof.

F. J. CHILD (a modernized version printed for private distribution, 1888).

It is a mistake, I may remark, when LINOW (p. 3, note 2) wishes to include among the Middle English versions of the monologue poems represented by the Old English poem of the Exeter and Vercelli Books the "Complaint of the Soul of William Basterdfeld" (HORSTMAN, 'Altenglische Legenden,' 1881, p. 467 and p. 329). There is in this instance no antagonism set up between soul and body, indeed they do not appear at all as separate personalities in the account which the soul gives of its sinful life, and no attempt is made to throw the blame of its damnation on the body. The address of the former is directed to "all crysten men."

In conclusion, it only remains to be observed with regard to the poems derived directly or indirectly from the "Visio," that the form of treatment did not become petrified along the lines which the pattern of that poem presented. To select random examples, in one of the Spanish versions (*Zs. f. rom. Phil.* ii, 68), an angel intervenes to rescue a soul from the devils who were about to carry it off, and the soul then delivers a long tirade against the wickedness of the world. Again, in the French version edited by STENGEL (*Zs. f. rom. Phil.* iv, 75 ff.) we have the piece opening with a vision of the poet who represents himself as wandering in a field covered with beautiful flowers, where he meets an aged hermit who draws from his bosom a rose containing, as it turns out, a new version of the conflict between body and soul. The same poem ends with a touching invocation to the Virgin Mary.

Last and most important characteristic of the later versions, the dramatic conception of the conflict which impresses itself on the form and which had already manifested itself strongly in the "Visio," gains more and more in force. The long speeches of the original debates become shorter and shorter, until in certain passages (cf. *Zs. f. rom. Phil.* 78 f. and BÖDDEKER'S 'Ms. Harl. 2253,' p. 230 ff.) they resolve themselves into strophe and anti-strophe, more or less regular in form and of decided lyrical quality.

J. D. BRUCE.

Centre College.

THE WANDERER.*

(Ascribed to CYNEWULF.)

Oft-times the Wanderer waiteth God's mercy,
Sad and disconsolate though he may be,
Far o'er the watery track must he travel,
Long must he row o'er the rime-crusted sea—
Plod his lone exile-path—Fate is severe.
Mindful of slaughter, his kinsman friend's death,
Mindful of hardships, the wanderer saith :
Oft must I lonely, when dawn doth appear,
Wail o'er my sorrow—since living is none
Whom I may whisper my heart's undertone,
Know I full well that in man it is noble
Fast in his bosom his sorrow to bind.
Weary at heart, yet his Fate is unyielding—
Help cometh not to his suffering mind.
Therefore do those who are thirsting for glory
Bind in their bosom each pain's biting smart.
Thus must I often, afar from my kinsmen,
Faste in fetters my home-banished heart.
Now since the day when my dear prince departed
Wrapped in the gloom of his dark earthen grave,
I, a poor exile, have wandered in winter
Over the flood of the foam-frozen wave,
Seeking, sadhearted, some giver of treasure,
Some one to cherish me friendless—some chief
Able to guide me with wisdom of counsel,
Willing to greet me and comfort my grief.
He who hath tried it, and he alone, knoweth
How harsh a comrade is comfortless Care
Unto the man who hath no dear protector,
Gold wrought with fingers, nor treasure so fair.
Chill is his heart as he roameth in exile—
Thinketh of banquets his boyhood saw spread ;
Friends and companions partook of his pleasures—
Comrades and pleasures alike now are dead.
Knoweth he well that all friendless and lordless
Sorrow awaits him a long bitter while ;—
Yet, when the spirits of Sorrow and Slumber
Faste with fetters the orphaned exile,
Seemeth him then that he seeth in spirit,
Meeteth and greeteth his master once more,
Layeth his head on his lord's loving bosom,
Just as he did in the dear days of yore.
But he awaketh, forsaken and friendless,
Seeth before him the black billows rise,
Seabirds are bathing and spreading their feathers,
Hailnow and hoar-frost are hiding the skies.
Then is his heart the more heavily wounded,
Longeth full sore for his loved one, his own,
Sad is the mind that remembereth kinsmen,
Greeting with gladness the days that are gone.
Seemeth him then on the waves of the ocean
Comrades are swimming—wellnigh within reach—
Yet from the spiritless lips of the swimmers

*Translated from the Old-English.

Cometh familiar no welcoming speech.
 So is his sorrow renewed and made sharper
 When the sad exile so often must send
 Thoughts of his suffering spirit to wander
 Wide o'er the waves where the rough billows blend.
 So, lest the thought of my mind should be clouded,
 Close must I prison my sadness of heart,
 When I remember my bold comrade-kinsmen,
 How from the mede-hall I saw them depart.
 Thus is the earth with its splendor departing—
 Day after day it is passing away,
 Nor may a mortal have much of true wisdom
 Till his world-life numbers many a day.
 He who is wise, then, must learn to be patient—
 Not too hot-hearted, too hasty of speech,
 Neither too weak nor too bold in the battle,
 Fearful, nor joyous, nor greedy to reach,
 Neither too ready to boast till he knoweth—
 Man must abide, when he vaunteth his pride,
 Till strong of mind he hath surely determined
 Whether his purpose can be turned aside.
 Surely the wise man may see like a desert
 How the whole wealth of the world lieth waste,
 How through the earth the lone walls are still standing
 Blown by the wind and despoiled and defaced.
 Covered with frost, the proud dwellings are ruined,
 Crumbled the wine-halls—the king lieth low,
 Robbed of his pride—and his troop have all fallen
 Proud by the wall—some, the spoil of the foe,
 War took away—and some the fierce sea-fowl
 Over the ocean—and some the wolf gray
 Tore after death—and yet others the hero
 Sad-faced has laid in earth-caverns away.
 Thus at his will the eternal Creator
 Famished the fields of the earth's ample fold—
 Until her dwellers abandoned their feast-boards,
 Void stood the work of the giants of old.
 One who was viewing full wisely this wall-place,
 Pondering deeply his dark, dreary life,
 Spake then as follows, his past thus reviewing,
 Years full of slaughter and struggle and strife :
 Whither, alas, have my horses been carried ?
 Whither, alas, are my kinspeople gone ?
 Where is my giver of treasure and feasting ?
 Where are the joys of the hall I have known ?
 Ah, the bright cup—and the corsleted warrior—
 Ah, the bright joy of a king's happy lot !
 How the glad time has forever departed,
 Swallowed in darkness, as though it were not !
 Standeth, instead of the troop of young warriors,
 Stained with the bodies of dragons, a wall—
 The men were cut down in their pride by the spear-points—
 Blood-greedy weapons—but noble their fall.
 Earth is enwrapped in the lowering tempest,
 Fierce on the stone-cliff the storm rushes forth,
 Cold winter-terror, the night-shade is dark'ning,
 Hail-storms are laden with death from the north.
 All full of hardships is earthly existence—

Here the decrees of the Fates have their sway—
 Fleeting is treasure, and fleeting is friendship—
 Here man is transient, here friends pass away.
 Earth's widely stretching, extensive domain,
 Desolate all—empty, idle, and vain.
 Thus spake the prudently-minded, seated apart at the
 council.
 Good is the man that keepeth his promise; nor must
 the chieftain
 Anger too hastily utter, ere he determine beforehand
 How, as a warrior noble should do, he must give
 satisfaction.
 Well shall it be with the man who seeketh divine
 consolation,
 Help from the Father in Heaven—only there to us all
 is there safety.

W. RICE SIMS.

University of Mississippi.

SWEET'S PHONETICS AND AMERICAN ENGLISH.

The new edition of SWEET'S 'Primer of Phonetics' is designed, as the author says in the preface, to replace the 'Hand-book' published thirteen years ago. It will be interesting, therefore, to compare it with the former book, as well as to discuss what SWEET calls American-English.

A comparison of the vowel system may be best made by giving the diagrams of English vowels in the 'Primer' and 'Hand-book.' In both cases the key-words are given, since SWEET has used different signs in the two tables: the broad ROMIC in the first published 'Hand-book' (p. 109), and the modified BELL symbols in the 'Primer' (p. 71).

HAND-BOOK.

	ij. feel			i. fill
v. bud.	ei. fail	a. father	ai. fly	e. head
	əə. bird	ə. hair	au. now	æ. had
uw. fool		u. full		
ou. no		oi. boy		
ɔ. fall		o. folly		

PRIMER.

			i. fill ij. sea
v. come		a. father ae. high	e. men ei. say
əə. bird	eə. care		au. how æ. man
		u. full uw. fool	
		ou. so oi. boy	
ɔ. fall		ɔ. not	

The most marked difference here shown is in the long vowels, or diphthongs, *i*, *ɛ*, *ü*, *ø*, all of which are given narrow in the 'Hand-book,' and wide in the 'Primer.' Of course, these signs refer to the beginning of sounds clearly diphthongic in London English, always represented in SWEET by *ij*, *ei*, *uw*, *ou*. SWEET had said in the 'Hand-book' (p. 110), "The narrowness of all English vowels is uncertain, especially the diphthongs *ij*, *ei*, *uw*, *ou*, which may all be pronounced wide, although they seem generally to be intermediate between narrow and wide." Subsequent investigation has proved that the vowels are wholly wide, as shown by his last tables.

The question then comes, What is the relation of this scheme to the vowels spoken in America? I carefully avoid saying American-English, because it has certainly never been determined that the vowel-sounds of different parts of the country are the same, nor can it be admitted that the speech of any part of the country is recognized as standard American. Most phoneticians in America have apparently followed SWEET or BELL in key-words rather than in vowel positions, with no question as to possible differences. The errors into which we may be led by this are evident from an example in SWEET's latest tables ('Hist. of Eng. Sounds,' p. 3; 'Primer,' p. 21). In these the sound "mid-mixed-narrow" is said to be that of American *earth*. Now in a large part of America *r* is sounded consonantal, though the italicizing of the letter in SWEET's example shows that no consonant *r* is intended. Moreover, the 'Primer' says this sound is that of

New York (the city presumably), where, as every one knows who has heard it, the pronunciation is peculiarly dialectal. From this key-word one living in western New York, or in the upper Mississippi valley, would get no correct idea of mid-mixed-wide. For these reasons remarks in this article are based on the dialect of western New York, and on that familiar to me as spoken by the New England people settling in Iowa within the last fifty years.

1. Vowel *i*. SWEET says ('Primer' §196) that in American-English *sea*, *cease* keep the old, long, undiphthongic high-front-narrow. In western New York the undiphthongic character is certain, but the vowel is wide rather than narrow. In my own speech there is often the beginning of a diphthongal glide, never so prominent, however, as in London English. The vowel is always wide.

2. Vowel *ɛ* (SWEET *ei*). This, says SWEET, is mid-front-wide in England and America. Here the sound is usually monophthongic, though occasionally a trace of the glide after the vowel is heard. In certain closed syllables, however, I find the narrow long closed *ɛ* (mid-front-narrow); examples are *make*, *take*, *plate*, etc. My own *ɛ* is slightly diphthongic and always wide.

3. Vowel *ə*. SWEET says that in American-English the old narrow (undiphthongic?) sound is preserved. In Ithaca dialect the sound is wide and undiphthongic, but in *few*, *new*, *juice*, the *u* of the diphthong *iu* is narrow. I give this *iu* in *new* also, and in many words where it is here *ə* only.

4. Vowel *ø*. SWEET makes this mid-back-wide-round in his later books, saying nothing of the American pronunciation. Here the vowel is wide and only slightly diphthongal, the writing of London English *ou* never representing the sound. My own *ø* is somewhat more diphthongic but never *ou*. [From observation for some three months of a typical Londoner, who has been in this country less than a year, I should say the English *ø* is narrow unquestionably, as placed by BELL.] SWEET places here also the *o* of *boy*, but says it is sometimes lowered. The lowering is true regularly here and in my own speech, so that it should be placed low-back-wide-round.

5. Before *r*, always sounded consonantal here and by myself, a glide is developed after these long vowels, and they are shortened so that the vowel and glide have the length of the vowel in other positions.

6. Vowel *a* (*father*). SWEET calls this mid-back-wide, though in Cockney English lowered to low-back-wide. Here it is always low-back-wide, as it is also in my own speech. [I believe this is the usual sound in America. BELL so places the vowel in his table, as given in VIETOR (p. 30-31; 1887). Dr. LEARNED (MOD. LANG. NOTES, April, 1890) calls the sound *a* of *car* in Pennsylvania German low-back-wide, putting over against it *a* (*father*) with question-mark, as if implying agreement with what I have here said.]

7. Vowel *ɔ* (*fall*). SWEET regards this as low-back-narrow-round, giving the same sound to *saw*, *soar* and *door* ('Hist. of Eng. Sounds,' p. 391, but cf. 'Primer' §202). Here the vowel is wide, I am confident, if my observation of the English vowel is correct. Before *r* in *soar*, *door*, the sound is always mid-back-wide-round, subject to the conditions of section 5 of this article. A comparison of the word-list (p. 391, 'Hist. of Eng. Sounds') would seem to indicate this as a characteristic difference between London English and that of this country, so far as I know it.

8. Vowel *o* (*not*). SWEET gives this low-back-wide-round, but says American-English "has sometimes mid-back-wide-round—which seems often to verge on the mixed (mid-mixed-wide-round)—sometimes the unrounded mid-back-wide of *father*." This sound is here and in my own speech always unrounded, corresponding to low-back-wide, our *a* of *father*. [PRIMER had called attention to this similarity in the South (cf. Amer. Jour. of Phil. ix, p. 206), saying that the *o* in *not* "stands probably on the border-line between guttural *a* and *o*." I suspect that this unrounded sound is of widespread use in America.]

9. Vowel *æ* in *air*, *there*. SWEET makes this low-front-narrow, and always designates it by *ɛə*. This is regularly low-front-wide here and in my own speech, but occasionally the low-front-narrow occurs.

10. Vowels *e* (*her*), *u* (*but*). SWEET calls the *e* (*her*) low-mixed-narrow, but says "in Ameri-

can-English this sound is raised towards mid-back-narrow, becoming mid-back-narrow-forward-lowered." This is with him the description of American *u* (*but*, *come*). Here the *r* is always heard consonantal, changing the sound slightly from that indicated by SWEET as American. I should call the sound low-mixed-narrow-retracted. The *u* (*but*) is, on the other hand, wide rather than narrow, the sound in English *but* never being heard here. It seems to me mid-back-wide-forward-lowered. In my own speech this sound is nearest *a* of *au* (*how*), which is retracted from the *a* of *au* in London English and in Ithaca dialect. This is by far the most difficult vowel to place, but I do not see how anyone who has heard an Englishman's *but* can think ours the same.

In conclusion I would point out two reasons for this article. If the facts cited are true for a single dialect, it is evident there is great danger in following even so great an authority as SWEET on vowel quality in America. The vowel sounds of two pronunciations have been given also with considerable care, in the hope that others in various parts of the country may be led to do the same, so that some accurate determination of the vowel system, or systems, of America may be made. The absolute necessity of this before any valuable dialectal work may be done, is evident.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.
Cornell University.

JANSSEN'S INDEX TO KLUGE'S DICTIONARY.

JANSSEN's Index presents to the owners of KLUGE's Dictionary so valuable a key to its contents that in gratitude we ought, perhaps, to say nothing of the compiler's shortcomings. Still, there is one thing connected with the manner in which he has prepared his index that needs to be pointed out, and whoever can should contribute toward correcting the mischief caused by it.

While it is nowhere stated that the Index belongs to the new edition of the Dictionary, this is implied in more ways than one. The first sheets of the new edition were printed in the summer of 1887, and the book was ready for the Christmas trade of 1888, while the preface to the Index is dated Oct. 1889. This of

itself is sufficient to lead one to suppose that it was the new edition that was made use of in preparing the Index. Moreover, the words appearing in the Addenda to the new edition are referred to in the Index as appearing there; and any one familiar with the changes made in the new edition, will here and there find that the Index gives the changed form or information (cf. O. E. *rāst* sub ROST 2, M. E. *lake*, p. 285, etc.). Thus the book pretends to be an index to the new edition.

Now, the fact is that the Index was made to the old edition, and the MS. was corrected to correspond with the new edition, but only here and there, apparently hit-or-miss. The truth of this statement is evident from the following:

In accord with the old edition JANSSEN

1. Fails to distinguish the O. E. diphthongs *ea*, etc., from the broken vowels (cf. *eage* sub AUGE, *eode* sub GEHEN), and *e* from *ɛ* (cf. *fetel* sub FESSEL 1), and *c* from *č* (cf. *cealc* sub KALK).

2. Copies old spellings and misprints that escaped the eye of the proof-reader of the old edition (cf. Goth. *aggvus* sub ENG, M. E. *braeinpanne* sub KOPF, Eng. *red* sub RETTEN).

3. Gives forms that have been changed in the new edition (cf. O. E. *ȝg* sub AU, O. E. *ȝyrel* sub DURCH, O. E. *cerse* sub KRESSE 1, Goth. *usanan* sub AHNDEN 1, etc.).

4. Gives forms that have been dropped in the new edition (cf. O. E. *steorn* sub STEUER 2, M. E. *rōsten* sub ROST 1, etc.).

5. Fails to give forms that have been supplied in the new edition (cf. O. E. *wuduwe* sub WITTIB, O. E. *blæwen* sub BLAU, O. E. *clāfre* sub KLEE, O. E. *earfe* sub ERBSE, etc.).

Moreover, where JANSSEN has attempted to correct his MS. by the new edition, he has, at times, done so in a very slipshod way. Thus under KILT he has supplied O. E. *cwyldseten* from the new edition, but has failed to notice that KLUGE had in the line before changed *cweldhrepe* of the old edition to *cwyldhrepe*. Under ALTAR he supplies O. E. *wihbed* from the new edition, but leaves the dialectic form *weobed* of the old edition; in like manner, under KÄSE he adds the O. E. *cýse* of the new edition and leaves the *cēse* of the old.

Now and then he gets things into even a worse state. Under FELGE the old edition has O. E. *felgan* and *felga*, the new *felg* and *felga*. JANSSEN noticed *felg* in the new edition and inserted it in his MS., but crossed out *felga* instead of *felgan*! Under NÄBER the old edition has M. E. *naugōr* while the new has *navegōr*, which caused JANSSEN to correct (?) his MS. so that it reads *nauvegōr*!

Some of this collating of the new edition seems to have been done after the body of the Index was printed. Under BRAUCHEN both editions of the dictionary have Goth. *brāhts* as also *brāks*, but in different lines. In preparing his Index to the old edition JANSSEN had recorded *brāhts* but missed *brāks*; now on looking over the new edition he detected *brāks* and thought it was a correction of *brāhts*, and so he instructs us on page 285 to change *brāhts* into *brāks*!

While this is a sad state of things, it is, probably, at its worst in the case of the Old and Middle English, for here Professor KLUGE has made a large number of additions and changes in the new edition. I am, therefore, glad to be able to correct the Index in this direction as well as in that of the Gothic forms. I have been enabled to do so by collating JANSSEN's work with indexes prepared for my private use by my aunt, Miss CAMILLA HÄNTZSCHE, and, in the case of the Gothic, the index prepared by Professor Wood's students at the Johns Hopkins University. It would be a good thing if the other lists in JANSSEN's Index could be corrected by special students; I hope at a future time to do so in the case of the modern English words, and have below supplied a few such forms that I chanced to find wanting.

Page 37 ff. Old English.

Below <i>ānad</i> insert † <i>anbiht</i> AMT.	After <i>beolene</i> read BIL- SENKRAUT.
Below <i>anfilt</i> insert † <i>angul</i> ANGEL.	Below <i>bīdan</i> insert <i>biddan</i> BITTEN.
Below <i>āðum</i> insert bū BEIDE.	Below <i>blast</i> insert † <i>blæwen</i> BLAU.
Below <i>becuman</i> insert -bed BEET.	Below <i>botm</i> insert <i>box</i> BÜCHSE.
After <i>beod</i> add ALTAR.	

† I have placed a † wherever the use of the old edition is betrayed by the form given or omitted by JANSSEN.

Place <i>bulle</i> above <i>bul-luca</i> .	Below <i>fâg</i> insert - <i>falcna</i> FALKE	Below <i>hrympele</i> insert - <i>hyrstan</i> RÜSTEN	Change <i>pumicstân</i> to <i>púmicstânu</i> .‡
Change <i>bersten</i> to <i>ber-stan</i> .	Change <i>felgan</i> to <i>felgat</i>	(the form is au-thenticated, cf. B-T).	Below <i>ræscetung</i> insert <i>träest</i> RAST.
Below <i>cæppe</i> insert ‡ <i>cærse</i> KRESSE I.	Below <i>flys</i> insert ‡ <i>flyte</i> FLOZ.	Cross out <i>hwôsan</i> Hus-TEN (it should be * <i>hwesan</i> or * <i>hwêsan</i> con-structed for <i>hwêlos</i> , cf. SIEV-ERS ^a §396c).	Change <i>râh</i> to <i>râhdêor</i> . After <i>reaf</i> add RAUBEN.
Below <i>cerran</i> cross out ‡ <i>cerse</i> KRESSE I.	After <i>fstme</i> read FLIETE.	Change <i>regenboga</i> to <i>regniboga</i> .‡	Change <i>rest</i> RAST.‡
Below <i>cêse</i> insert ‡ <i>cest</i> KISTE	Below <i>frea</i> insert - <i>frec</i> FRECH.	Cross out <i>ripan</i> to <i>ripan</i> .	Change <i>ripan</i> to <i>ripan</i> .
Change <i>cildelâp</i> to <i>cild-clâp</i> .	After <i>freo</i> add FREI-TAG.	Change <i>rysce</i> to <i>rýsce</i> .‡	Change <i>rysce</i> to <i>rýsce</i> .‡
Change <i>cist,-e</i> to <i>ciste</i> .‡	Change <i>frigu</i> to FRIGU.	Below <i>sand</i> (which is <i>sgnd</i> in the new ed.) insert	Below <i>sand</i> (which is <i>sgnd</i> in the new ed.) insert
Below <i>clâg</i> insert - <i>clâne</i> KLEIN ‡ <i>clâfre</i> KLEE.	Below <i>gædeling</i> insert - <i>gædere</i> GATTE.	After <i>hyd</i> add HUFE.	‡ <i>scâp</i> SEIFE.
Below <i>cnocian</i> insert - <i>cnoll</i> KNOLLEN.	Below <i>gærstapa</i> insert ‡ <i>gêst</i> GEIST.	After <i>hyll</i> add HALLE I (for KLUGE's hill should be <i>hyll</i>).	Below <i>sâwl</i> insert ‡ <i>scâb</i> SCHIEF.
Cross out <i>cweldhrepe</i> KILT.‡	Cross out <i>geâfe</i> GABE,‡ and insert <i>geaful</i> GA-BEL.	Change <i>ifig</i> to <i>ifig</i> .	Below <i>scâð</i> insert ‡ <i>scâf</i> SCHIEF.
Below <i>cweorn</i> insert ‡ <i>cwice</i> QUECKE.	After <i>geard</i> add GARN.	Below <i>ifig</i> insert ‡ <i>ig</i> AU.	Below <i>sceppan</i> insert sci SCHINDEN.
Above <i>cwyldseten</i> in- sert	Below <i>gearewe</i> insert - <i>gearwe</i> GAR.	Below <i>in</i> insert - <i>incel</i> ENKEL 2.	Change <i>scipincl</i> to <i>scip-</i> <i>incel</i> .‡
‡ <i>cwyldhrepe</i> KILT	The form <i>geoglêre</i> is JANSSEN's substi-tute for KLUGE's jüglere.	Below <i>lêst</i> cross out lære LEER.	Place <i>scriðan</i> above <i>scrûd</i> .
Place <i>cyrtel</i> below <i>cyrran</i> .	Below <i>ginian</i> insert - <i>ginnan</i> BEGIN-NEN.	Below <i>lêg</i> insert - <i>lege</i> ORLOG-SCHIFF.	After <i>sigðe</i> add SÄGE.
After <i>dâl</i> add URTEL.	Change <i>hælep</i> to <i>hælep</i> .	Below <i>leoð</i> insert - <i>leoðian</i> LEDIG	Below <i>slîw</i> insert slâma SCHLUM-MERN
Below <i>dott</i> insert - <i>drabbe</i> TREBER.	Below <i>haga</i> insert ‡ <i>hagan</i> HECKE 2.	Cross out <i>lepin</i> LEDIG (the word is M.E.).	Change <i>slumerian</i> to <i>slîmerian</i> .‡
Place <i>dræbb</i> below <i>dra-ca</i> .	Below <i>hagaporn</i> insert - <i>hagian</i> (BE)HAG-EN.	Cross out <i>liexan</i> LICHT.‡	Below <i>snîpan</i> insert ‡ <i>snôd</i> SCHNUR I.
Below <i>duru</i> insert dûst DUNST.	Cross out <i>hide</i> HUFE.	Change <i>liðincl</i> to <i>liðin-cel</i> .‡	Cross out <i>so</i> SONST.
Change <i>dweorg</i> to <i>dwe-orh</i> .	Change <i>hin</i> to <i>hin-</i> .	After <i>lixan</i> add LICHT.‡	Below <i>solor</i> insert ‡ <i>sgnd</i> SAND.
Below <i>dyre</i> insert ‡ <i>dyrne</i> TARNKAP-PE	Change <i>hleoper</i> to <i>hleo-por</i> .	Below <i>maser</i> insert ‡ <i>mâst</i> MEIST.	After <i>spearhafo</i> SPER-BER add: p. 407.
Below <i>eard</i> insert éâre OHR.	Below <i>hondgeworc</i> in- sert	Change <i>midd-</i> to <i>midd</i> .	Place <i>spelian</i> below <i>spêlan</i> .
Below <i>earendel</i> insert ‡ <i>earse</i> ERBSE.	‡ <i>hop-</i> HÜFTE.	Below <i>môdor</i> insert môdra niht WEI-HEN.	Cross out <i>sputtan</i> SPENTZEN.
Change <i>égþyrel</i> to <i>ég-þýrel</i> .‡	Below <i>hoppian</i> insert hôr cf. hôre.	Below <i>môs</i> insert môste MÜSSEN.	Below <i>spyrian</i> insert spytan SPENT-ZEN.
Below <i>ewic</i> insert ‡ <i>ewon</i> AUE 2.	Below <i>hrætele</i> insert - <i>hragian</i> RAGEN.	Change <i>myre</i> to <i>myre</i> .	Below <i>stæfn</i> insert stâger STEIL.
Below <i>etan</i> insert - <i>ettan</i> ANHEISCH-IG.	After <i>hrêremâs</i> add FLEDERMAUS.	After <i>naca</i> add KAHN.‡	Below <i>stâne</i> insert ‡ <i>stæppan</i> STAPFE.
		Change <i>þost</i> to <i>þost</i> .‡	Below <i>stefta</i> insert stela STIEL.
		Change <i>peosa</i> to <i>peose</i> .‡	
		Change <i>pisa</i> to <i>pise</i> .‡	
		Below <i>popig</i> insert ‡ <i>portic</i> PFORTE.	

Below <i>stemn</i> insert †steola STIEL.	Change <i>þegen</i> to <i>þegnt</i> Insert - <i>þehsa</i> EIDECHSE	Below <i>bilaigón</i> read † <i>bileiban</i> .	Change <i>skillings</i> to <i>skilliggs</i> .
Cross out <i>steorn</i> STEU- ER 2.‡	Below <i>púma</i> insert þunþjan ZWANG	Change <i>braids</i> to <i>braips</i> .	Below <i>söps</i> insert spai(s)kuldr SPEI-
Cross out <i>steppan</i> STAPFE.‡	Change <i>þyrel</i> to <i>þyret</i> ‡	Below <i>brükjan</i> insert bráks BRAUCHEN	After standan add SCHWINDEN.
After <i>sund</i> add GESUND.	Below <i>wæccan</i> insert -wæccan WUCH- ER.	Below <i>brusts</i> read brápfaps.	Change <i>staps</i> to <i>stab</i> .‡
Below <i>sür</i> insert †súlere SCHUS- TER.	Change <i>wælcyrie</i> to <i>wælcyrie</i> .	Below <i>dailja</i> insert dailjan TEIL.	Change <i>stikr</i> to <i>stiks</i> .
Below <i>swá</i> insert -swélan SCHWÜL.	Below <i>weartre</i> insert †weaxan WACHSEN	Change <i>falpr</i> to <i>falps</i>	Below <i>sulja</i> insert sun- SÜDEN.
Change <i>sweoster</i> to <i>sweostor</i> .	Change <i>wel</i> to <i>wél</i> .‡	Below <i>filhan</i> insert -fill FELL.	After sunus read SOHN.
Change <i>swigian</i> to <i>swi- gian</i> .	Cross out <i>weóbed</i> AL- TAR.‡	Below <i>fragildan</i> insert frah FRAGEN.	Change <i>swammr</i> to <i>swamms</i> .
Below <i>swið</i> insert swél SCHWÜL.	Below <i>weorc</i> insert -weorn EICH- HORN.	Below <i>frähunþans</i> in- sert	Above talzjan insert taikns ZEICHEN.
Change <i>sylian</i> to <i>sył- ian</i> .‡	Below <i>Westerfalcna</i> in- sert	<i>fraihans</i> } FRAG- <i>fraihnan</i> } EN.	After taujan read THUN.
Change <i>tæcan</i> to <i>tæc- ean</i> .‡	Change <i>welðer</i> WIDDER.	Below <i>frijónðs</i> insert -friks FRECH.	Change -tilr to -tis.
Change <i>tifer</i> to <i>tifer</i> .‡	Below <i>wilcumen</i> insert wild WILD.	Below <i>gairnjan</i> insert †gait- ZIEGE.	After trauan read TRAUEN.
Below <i>töh</i> insert †töhopa HOFFEN.	After <i>winnan</i> add ÜBER- WINDEN.	After <i>giban</i> cross out GIFT.‡	Change <i>tuz</i> to <i>tuz</i> .
Below <i>tollére</i> insert †tóm ZAHM.	Place <i>wrist</i> and <i>writan</i> below wringan.	Below <i>plaqus</i> insert pláhi- FLUCHT	Change <i>paurseip</i> to <i>paurseip</i> .
Below <i>tredan</i> insert trega TRÄGE.	Below <i>wudu</i> insert †wuduwe WITTIB	Below <i>pliuhán</i> insert -praihns DRING-	Below <i>haims</i> change the dash to HEIM.
Change <i>twegen</i> to <i>twé- gen</i> .‡	Cross out <i>þg Au</i> .‡	EN.	After halba add : and 2
Change <i>twentig</i> to <i>twéntig</i> .‡		Below <i>ufta</i> insert ufpanjan DEHNEN.	Above <i>hi</i> -insert hér HIER.
	Page 57 ff., Gothic.	Change <i>usanan</i> to <i>uz- anan</i> .‡	Change hinder to hin- dar.
Change <i>afgup</i> to <i>af- guþs</i> .	Below <i>atta</i> insert Attila ÄTTE.	Below <i>wakjan</i> insert wakjan WECKEN	Below <i>hrugga</i> insert hrükjan KRÄHEN.
Change <i>aggwus</i> to <i>agg- wus</i> .‡	Change <i>auhs</i> OCHSE to auhsa OCHSE.	Below <i>warjan</i> insert warmjan WARM.	After <i>lipus</i> add BILD.
After <i>ahma</i> add ACH- TEN.	Below <i>azgō</i> insert þba, ba þō BEIDE.	After wasjan cross ont WASEN.‡	Below <i>ludja</i> insert ludjb- LEUTE.
After <i>air</i> ff. change ER- STE to ERST.	Below <i>bagms</i> insert -bahts AMT.	After <i>weihan</i> change the dash to WEIG- AND.	Change <i>gius</i> to <i>qiwa-</i> and cross out KNOCHEN.‡
Below <i>aippau</i> insert aiw JE, NIE.	After <i>bandi</i> add BAN- DE.	Below <i>wépna</i> insert wérs ALBERN.	After <i>razn</i> add HAUS.
After -anan change us- anan to uzanan‡	Cross out <i>barn</i> GEBURT	Change <i>wriakn</i> to <i>wri- kan</i> .	Below <i>rinnō</i> insert þram RAUM.
After and- add AMT.	Below <i>beidan</i> read beitan.	Page 100 ff., Middle English.	Cross out <i>sama</i> GLEICH
Below and- insert anda- ANT-	Afte bida add KIRCHE.	Change braeinpanne to brainpanne.‡	After <i>skéwan</i> add GE- SCHEHEN.
After arms add BARM- HERZIG.	Change <i>bidagwa</i> to †*bidaqa, *bidaqón	Below <i>caul</i> insert chaine KETTE 2.	Below <i>brimmen</i> change BREME to BRUMMEN.

Below <i>coker</i> insert ‡ <i>combreñ</i> KUM- MER.	Below <i>mörberie</i> insert <i>morge, t morwe,</i> MORGEN I.
Cross out <i>cumbren</i> KUMMER.‡	<i>mörter MÖRSER.</i> <i>moppe MOTTE.</i>
Below <i>cwême</i> insert ‡ <i>dären</i> TARNKAPPE	Change <i>nauvegør</i> to <i>navegør‡</i>
Below <i>galingale</i> insert <i>garden</i> GARTEN	Below <i>rāde</i> insert <i>rail RIEGEL.</i>
Below <i>halsien</i> insert ‡ <i>hame</i> KUMMET.	Below <i>rime</i> insert ‡ <i>rip</i> REFF I.
Cross out <i>hrip</i> REFF I‡	Cross out <i>ristenRost</i> I‡
Below <i>kitlung</i> insert ‡ <i>kive</i> KÜBEL.	Change <i>scropien</i> to <i>scrapien.</i>
Change <i>knokel</i> to <i>kno-</i> <i>kil.</i> ‡	Change <i>thight</i> to <i>thiht.</i>
Above <i>lake</i> insert - <i>læred</i> GELEHRT (p. 206).	Change <i>twitesen</i> to <i>twiteren.</i>

Page 149.—Below *hamble* insert
‡*hame* KUMMET.

Page 154.—After *red* cross out RETTEN.‡
Below *rich* insert
‡*rid* RETTEN.

Page 245.—The foot note belongs on the preceding page.

Page 285.—Under GOTISCH, JANSSEN tells us to read *spaiskuldr* for *spaikuldr*, but he had dropped the word out of his Index, probably because it was starred.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

NOTKER'S 'PSALMS.'

The third number of the 'Schriften zur germanischen Philologie,' edited by MAX RODIGER, contains a treatise by JOHANN KELLE which bears the title: 'Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung, Übersetzung, Grammatik, der Psalmen Notkers' (Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1889). It forms the last of a series of grammatical researches which KELLE has made on the existing translations of NOTKER and of which the one upon BOETHIUS' 'De consolatione philosophiae' appeared in the *Wiener Sitzungsberichte* Bd. 109, the one upon MARCIANUS CAPELLA's 'De nuptiis philologiae et Mercurii' in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* Bd. 30, that upon ARISTOTLE's 'De

categoris' in *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* Bd. 18, that entitled "De syllogismis, De partibus logicae, De rhetorica arte, De musica" in *Zeitschrift f. d. Ph.* Bd. 20. As the most important result of all these researches we have to consider the proof which KELLE believes he has brought forward for NOTKER's authorship, based upon the similarity and peculiarity of the language in the above mentioned works. "Der Wortvorrat," says KELLE, p. 46, "weist also die Annahme zurück, dass verschiedene, gleichzeitig an demselben Orte und aus derselben Gegend stammende Personen sich der gleichen Laute und Formen bedienten, er bestätigt die gleich charakteristische Einheit, welche diese Übersetzungen in Lauten und Formen sowie in Bildung der Worte ausweisen, und aus der schon allein hervorgeht, dass dieselbe Person, welche des BOETHIUS 'De consolatione,' des CAPELLA 'De nuptiis,' des ARISTOTELES 'De categoris et perihermenis' übersetzte und kommentierte, auch die Psalmen verdeutscht und erklärt hat." It was W. WACKERNAGEL who, in a lecture upon "Die Verdienste der Schweizer um die deutsche Literatur" said, in spite of the clear testimony of NOTKER, that no one man could have translated all these works, but that we had to deal with a school, in which under NOTKER's influence these writings had been translated. But NOTKER, in a letter to the bishop HUGO VON SITTEN, says that he has made not only the above-mentioned translations, but also a number of others, which unfortunately are lost. Among them were VIRGIL'S 'Bucolica,' TERENCE'S 'Andria,' BOETHIUS' 'De Sancta Trinitate' and JOB. Many well-known writers of histories of German literature adopted WACKERNAGEL'S view, and even SCHERER, in the last edition of his 'Literaturgeschichte,' writes of NOTKER: "Er hat viele Arbeiten verfasst oder angeregt."

KELLE has divided his work into three parts. In the first he speaks of the versions of NOTKER'S 'Psalms' which have come down to us, and explains the relations of the different codices to each other. He shows especially that the St. Gall Codex 21 (=SG) which was formerly in Einsiedel, was transcribed in the twelfth century from the same codex (which seems to be lost) from which, in 1675, LA LOUBERE

ordered a copy to be made. Cf. KELLE, 'Die St. Galler deutschen Schriften und Notker Labeo.' This copy too is missing, but an apograph of it was made for SCHILTER and edited in his 'Thesaurus' by JOANNES FRICKIUS. From this apograph the Dane ROSTGAARD made a copy (=R), now in the royal library at Copenhagen, and compared it with LA LOUBERE's text.

In the second chapter, "Zur Übersetzung der Psalmen NOTKER'S," KELLE proves: first, that the translations of the 'Psalms,' of 'De cons.,' 'De nupt.' and 'De cat.' are by the same author; second, that the interlinear glossaries which are found in SG and R cannot be, on account of their dialect peculiarities, the work of NOTKER himself.

In the third part, "Zur Grammatik der Psalmen Notkers," KELLE gives a detailed grammar of the verb, the noun and the adjective in NOTKER's 'Psalms'; and a record of the variant forms occurring in NOTKER's other works, makes these chapters complete for all his works.

KELLE does not undertake to treat the pronouns and numerals separately, but will study the peculiarities of their use in NOTKER's works in another treatise, 'Lautlehre der Notkerschen Sprache,' soon to be published.

MAX POLL.

Harvard University.

RUDYARD KIPLING AND CLEARNESS.

No teacher of practical rhetoric remains long ignorant of the fact that many of the statements of the best text-books are hardly more than ideals. As such they possibly do less harm than good, but now and then he is startled by the amount of discretion entrusted to him—perhaps a more accurate phrasing would put it, imposed upon him. For a number of years my attention has been called to the difficulty of squaring the orthodox rules on clearness with the successful practice of writers of all grades. Critics as well as teachers are familiar with the rich embroidery of MILTON's unfamiliar geography and unknown heroes, and an easy explanation is usually found in the pleasure conferred upon

the ear of the reader, in whatever need of notes his understanding may be. Few students have not been exasperated by EMERSON's elusive references and allusions, and for a fair proportion of them, I fancy, no reasonable explanation can be found on ordinary rhetorical principles.

The difficulty in dealing with this question lies in the fact that it is almost impossible to secure what scientists call an isolated instance. Illustration that by no stretch of the imagination can be made to illustrate, and examples that exemplify only after a deduction that would do honor to KANT, are so inextricably interwoven with the other factors that have made the whole style subtle, vigorous or charming, that they not only escape blame but often get part of the credit. In work of this sort, too, the professional judgment is almost the only one that can be procured, because the ordinary reader either attributes his lack of interest to his own culpable stupidity, or accounts for his interest by the impeccable perfection of his author. The professional critic is open to the objection applicable to any expert. He is sophisticated. He has cultivated a taste for rebuses. He does not know them as such half the time when he sees them and, ten to one, when he does, he likes them for the easy sense of power they afford him.

The works of SHAKESPEARE, MILTON, CARLYLE, MEREDITH and BROWNING, because they are classics or the property of a cult, or for some other of the unsatisfactory but thoroughly disqualifying reasons existing in such connections, do not serve the purpose of the teacher or the philosophical critic. He must find something that plain people enjoy and that they are not afraid to talk about. RUDYARD KIPLING's stories afford an excellent case in point. Making all due allowance for the fact that they have been somewhat the fashion, people have had a most genuine enjoyment out of them. It is noticeable, however, that nearly every reader has thought their appeal likely to be peculiar to himself, and has been surprised when he found his neighbor enjoying them quite as well. KIPLING affords extraordinary facilities for discovery, judging from the number of people

who fancy that they have discovered him. Allowance, too, must be made for the charm of the story-teller. In these days of overwrought analysis, readers will endure much for the sake of a story that never ceases to be about something. And the plain reader without the 'Imperial Dictionary' or even with all the numbers of the 'Century' beside him, has a good deal to bear. What is a *pipal*, why has it a crook, and does it always overhang? One's memory of BURNS, helped out by the context, removes the necessity of further inquiry for the meaning of *catty*, the 'Imperial' sets one at rest about a *nullah*, but a *ruction* remains as problematical as the big *Sisham*, or the exact way *Gonds* stand when they meditate. These examples have been taken at random from one volume of LOVELL's reprint. They are by no means the blindest nor the most elaborate of their kind. Words darken counsel most when the natives talk about horses, their treatment and equipage. But the point to which I wish to call attention is, that while nobody fails to appreciate this element of the unfamiliar and the unknown, nobody resents it very bitterly, and a few are bold enough to declare that it is a distinct factor in their pleasure. Assuming these few to be faithful and competent recorders of their own experience, three hypotheses are possible for its explanation. First, that these stories are the result of a most careful and perfect adjustment to a certain class of readers, although not to the ones under discussion. That the pleasure of the latter is due to an intuitive perception of this adjustment and response to it as far as is possible, combined with the anticipation of further pleasure when circumstances render the response complete. In other words, there are persons in England and India to whom the expression of these stories is charming for its familiarity, for its perfect intelligibility, who laugh and cry "for old sake's sake," instead of at what we call the freshness of it. This supposition is borne out by the careful way in which KIPLING treats references and allusions bearing even in the remotest way upon scholastic interests. He translates the commonplaces of science and philosophy, apparently to keep within range of somebody's understanding—possibly, how-

ever, for the sake of a certain vivacity thereby imparted to his handling of well-worn topics. This supposition requires no important modification of the ordinary rhetorical canons. It is in effect to say, "Choose your audience, and if it consist of but one man, make your meaning perfectly clear to him and you will have succeeded; other men will share his pleasure in proportion as they share his intelligence; the rest of the world are your readers at their peril."

Second, that the adjustment was at no time perfect, nor ever aimed to be. That the author worked always with his eye on the object rather than on the audience, and would have enjoyed the creature of his own fancy if no other mortal had ever spoken well of it. That he was pushed on from point to point in his work by the desire to embody a certain ideal that he could never make clear because it was never clear to him. It was simply impelling. In this effort some elements produced form by their combination, others did not. In one case he succeeded, in the other he failed. His success or failure in either case would be independent of his audience. Their pleasure would depend upon: first, their ability to share his interest in the ideal; second, his power to maintain the impression of form in their minds. A careful analysis of KIPLING's literary method bears out this view. His use of the unfamiliar is not mechanical, but organic. He does not explain his diction, references and allusions as MACAULAY does, nor as most so-called rhetoricians of the careful type do. On the other hand, there is at certain points an essential difference between his obscurity and that of EMERSON, MEREDITH or BROWNING, and an essential similarity at others. The plain reader, perhaps, would make no distinction here, but see always an essential difference in that he would be able to follow KIPLING, while the others he would eventually give up in discouragement. But without going into any discussion of the other authors, it is not to be denied that even in the particular cases cited from KIPLING's stories there is a difference in the way the foreign element is used, and a corresponding difference in the resulting impression. Judged by any standard of comparison, the side-conversation in 'With

the Main Guard' between Ortheris and Mulvaney where the word *ruction* is used, is not as happily nor as forcibly managed as most such episodes by KIPLING. That this difference is due to something besides the mere character of the adjustment to the reader's comprehension, is clear from a consideration of the fact that the words themselves are all equally familiar or unfamiliar. But nobody fails to recognize (though unconsciously perhaps) the presence of outward form indicating the influence of an organizing idea behind it wherever it exists. In this regard CHARLES DARWIN's struggles to write clearly, as described by himself, when considered in connection with the resulting style, point to a like conclusion. The nonsense verses of LEWIS CARROLL owe their charm to the skill with which the form is maintained in the incongruous material. They are nonsense, perhaps, but nearly everybody tries to make them sense, an influence by no means common to all forms of the unintelligible. Moreover, the value of nonsense fluctuates in accordance with its possession of this quality. Some of it is "delicious," some of it, and by far the greater part, only tiresome. Tiresome nonsense and tiresome sense will be found to be possessed of formal elements singularly alike. Not to be led too far away from the main subject of investigation, this second hypothesis calls for a very considerable modification and elaboration of the ordinary rhetorical exposition of clearness. A sharper distinction needs to be made between the ideal and the mechanical elements in expression, and a more careful allotment of their provinces. It will be seen that the essential character of so-called ornament has been largely misunderstood, and that it needs more careful analysis; that the distinction between the processes of invention and of reproduction has been sharply made and too broadly insisted upon.

Third, it may be that the unintelligible is of right a distinct source of pleasure, that it is, whether we recognize it or not, a latent factor in all expression, and that we err in not taking account of it. For so general a principle as this, I find no evidence of the formal sort in KIPLING. But it is worthy of passing notice that the least as well as the most highly cul-

tured members of society agree in their enjoyment of what is beyond their comprehension. It is almost invariably a middle class, that live by the letter, who resent its appearance and disbelieve its *de jure* existence. CAMPBELL, I believe, is the only formal rhetorician who has given the meaningless any extended notice. He, however, does not elevate it to a positive factor of expression. At most, he treats of it as escaping censure and ridicule by its relative character. In other words, he forces it to seek the protection of the reader for whom it will have meaning and so be subject to all the considerations of adjustment—our first hypothesis.

My observation leads me to believe that the majority of persons hold one or both of the positions last described. Many of them hesitate to take the bold step of acknowledging an interest for which they cannot fully account. For such there are nearly always conventional beauties that may be praised, and safe virtues to be commended. It was not one of these who said the other day, in reply to a question, "Of course I don't understand half of it. But I enjoy it, just as I enjoy being pulled along by an express train through a perfectly foreign country; and I want it distinctly understood that I don't travel for the sake of the things that other nations have in common with us, but for their differences."

Granting even a modicum of truth in the foregoing analysis, the practical question still remains, How far is it safe to admit the difficult, the unfamiliar, the unintelligible into a process, one (at least) of whose uses is to serve as a means of communication? The formal rhetorician probably will not admit the propriety of the question even. They are all to be removed in the interests of the reader. But the verdict is a hasty one, and involves a principle fatal to the production of the best work. Adjustment to the reader is at best a secondary consideration and ultimately involves, when elevated to a principle, the admitted failure to attain the highest merit. Masterpieces make their appeal directly, and can neither be produced by rule nor explained by precept. That they do not offend against either is true, because the greater includes the less. The best is never too good for the

crowd. May it not be questioned, then, whether the elevation of adjustment to the importance of a principle is much more than a practical device for finding out what particular kind of badness will be endured?

M. A. JORDAN.

Smith College.

THE INVENTOR OF THE ENGLISH HEXAMETER.

Among the unfortunates whose names have been handed down to literary obloquy, perhaps none has been more the victim of circumstances than Dr. GABRIEL HARVEY. A grave and really learned man of a somewhat irritable and testy disposition, he was guilty of two false steps in denying his own humble origin and in refusing to let the grave protect a paltry foe from the lash of his revenge. No one can doubt that the Doctor richly deserved the tremendous trouncing which he received at the hands of the irrepressible author of 'Have with you to Saffron Walden'; but those who prefer the truth to the brilliant satire and invective of THOMAS NASHE, the biased narrative of D'ISRAELI, or even the prejudiced representations of Dr. GROSART, should turn to Professor MORLEY's interesting essay, entitled "Spenser's Hobbinol" (*Fortnightly Rev.* xi, pp. 274-283) for a general vindication, which, however, strangely enough omits to answer one of the chief counts of the indictment.

A reference to any average text-book on English Literature, if it be sufficiently full to warrant a mention of him, will disclose that HARVEY was the inventor of the English hexameter, or at least boasted himself to be such, or desired only to be so epitaphed. Whereupon much rhetoric is bestowed upon the absurdity of the hexameter, the inventor, and the boast; and the friend of SPENSER is forthwith dubbed "a fantastical pedant" and wicked seducer of SIDNEY and SPENSER from the paths of poetic rectitude into the stony ways of classical metres in English verse.

Turning to the authorities, we meet with the same charges based upon the same statement of HARVEY's supposed words. Here are some of them:

"Gabriel Harvey desired only to be 'epitaphed' the inventor of the English hexameter."¹

"He [Harvey] boasted himself the inventor and introducer of English hexameter."²

"If I never deserve any better remembrance," he exclaims in one of his pamphlets, 'let me be epitaphed the inventor of the English hexameter.'³

"Hence the following egotistical boast in one of his wordy contests with Nashe: If I never, etc. . . . let me be epitaphed, etc."⁴

"Harvey, Spenser's friend, was one of the chief patrons, if not the inventor of the English hexameter."⁵

"If I never deserve, etc. . . . let me be epitaphed the Inventor of the English Hexamer."⁶

Even Mr. ARBER, who quotes more correctly than the older authorities, does not finish the passage and hence gives it the same coloring; thus:

"If I neuer deserue anye better rembraunce, let mee rather be epitaphed the Inventor of the English Hexameter: whom learned M. Standihurst imitated in his Virgill, and excellent Sir Philip Sidney disdained not to follow in his *Arcadia* and elsewhere."⁷

And Dr. GROSART, HARVEY's latest editor, shows that he prefers the interpretation of the critics to his author's own words, by this exclamation, which can be based alone on the above curtailed and garbled quotation of the original passage.

"None but a 'fantastic pedant' could have insisted on experiment so nonsensical, and none but a man blinded by 'vanity' could so have boasted of being the Inventor of Hexamer."⁸

I shall give the passage entire and in its context, that we may have before us the original of this curious misquotation.

"It goeth somewhat hard in my harsh Legend, when the father of Musicke must be mocked, not Tubalcain, as he mistearneth him, but Tuball, whom Genesis youtsafeth honourable mention: and the Hexameter

1. DR. FARMER'S "ESSAY ON THE LEARNING OF SH." MALONE'S 'SH.' i. p. 327.

2. DRAKE, 'SH. AND HIS TIMES,' i. 457.

3. CRAIK, 'SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF LITERATURE AND LEARNING IN ENGLAND,' iii, p. 63.

4. BRYDGES 'CENSURA LITTERARIA,' i. p. 402.

5. WARTON, 'HISTORY OF ENGLISH POETRY,' iii, p. 324.

6. *ibid.*, note by PARK.

7. STANDIHURST'S 'FIRST FOUR BOOKS OF VIRGIL,' ARBER'S 'ENGLISH SCHOLAR'S LIBRARY' NO. 10, p. vii.

8. 'WORKS OF HARVEY,' ED. GROSART, INTROD. i. p. xlvi.

verse flouted: whereof neither Homer in Greeke, nor Virgil in Latin, (how valorous Autors?) nor Alexander in conquest, nor Augustus in maiesty, (how puissant Princes?) were ashamed: but accompted it the onely gallant trumpet of braue, and Heroicall Acts: and I wis, the English is nothing too good to imitate the Greeke and Latine, or other eloquent Languages, that honour the Hexameter, as the soueraigne of verses and high Controwler of Rimes. If I neuer deserue anye better remembrance, let me rather be Epitaphed, The Inventor of the English Hexameter; whom learned M. Standhurst imitated in his Virgill, and excellent Sir Philip Sidney disdained not to follow in his Arcadia, and elsewhere: then be chronicled, the greene maister of Blacke Arte: or the founder of vgly oaths: or the father of misbegotten *Infortunatus*: or the Scriuner of Crossbiters: or as one of his own sectaries termed him, the Patriarch of shifters. Happy man I, if these two be my hainousest crimes and deadliest sinnes: To bee the Inuentor of the English Hexameter, and to be orderlie clapt in the Flete for the aforesaide Letter.⁹

The most careless perusal of this passage shows that in it HARVEY is answering an attack previously made upon him. The letter is headed, "To every Reader fauourable, or indifferentlie affected,"¹⁰ and its tone throughout is that of apology and self-justification against the unjust charges of an opponent.

Without going into the shredded and unsavory details of the notorious NASHE-HARVEY controversy, of which perhaps more than enough has already been written, I may call attention to the works which form the previous pleadings in the case. The provocation, it will be remembered, came from ROBERT GREENE, and appeared in the first impression of his 'A Quip for an Upstart Courtier,' in 1592. What the precise words of that provocation were, it is impossible to discover at this late date. But Dr. GROSART's assumption that the whole affront was contained in the fact that GREENE "had incidentally, almost accidentally, described Garbriel Harvey and his two brothers as sons of a Ropemaker at Saffron Walden,"¹¹ is untenable, by Dr. GROSART's own showing. For in a note prefixed to his reprint of 'A Quip for an Upstart

9. 'Foure Letters and Certaine Sonnets,' 'Works of Harvey,' ed. GROSART, i, pp. 181-82.

10. *ibid.*, p. 176.

11. 'Works of Nashe,' ed. GROSART, Introd. i, p. liv.

Courtier' he states: "I am enabled to give my text of the 'quips' from an exemplar of 1592 (in the British Museum, King's Library); but neither it nor that in the Huth Library contains a passage that originally occurred in it, of peculiar offensiveness to Gabriel Harvey. The first and (apparently) second issues of 1592 seem to have been so effectually suppressed that none is now known."¹²

HARVEY, outraged and insulted, replied to GREENE in 'Foure Letters and Certaine Sonnets'; and, GREENE unfortunately dying in the interim, the Doctor had the bad taste and want of feeling to slander the playwright's memory. It was then that NASHE rushed to the rescue in his 'Wonderful, strange and miraculous Astrologicall Prognostications' and his 'Strange Newes of the intercepting of Certain Letters'; and rejoinder and surrejoinder then followed.

Now, as we do not find them elsewhere in any previous stage of the controversy, we may assume that the expressions: "Maister of Black Arte," "founder of ugly oaths," etc. etc., of HARVEY'S "letter" quoted above, were among the epithets used by GREENE and applied to HARVEY in the suppressed passage of the first impression of 'A Quip for an Upstart Courtier.' HARVEY had doubtless also been taunted by GREENE with being the inventor of the English hexameter, a taunt to which his exchange of letters with SPENSER,¹³ published a few years before, offered an excellent handle. Well might any man prefer to "be epitaphed the inventor of the English hexameter," rather than be abused in any of the opprobrious terms quoted in the apology above. It would be difficult to conceive of anything further removed from a boast than this famous utterance.

There is one more quotation of interest in this connection. In his 'Strange Newes, etc.,' or 'Foure Letters Confuted,' which, it is to be remembered, is the immediate answer to HARVEY'S 'Foure Letters and Certaine Sonnets,' NASHE thus apostrophizes:

12. 'Works of Greene,' ed. GROSART, xi, p. 206, note.

13. See 'Three Proper and wittie, familiar Letters etc.,' and 'Two other verie Commendable Letters,' both published in 1580 and reprinted in 'Harvey's works' ed. GROSART vol. i and elsewhere.

"Tubalcain, Tubalcan, alias Tuball, first founder of Farries Hall, heere is a great complaint made, that *utriusque Academiae Robertus Greene* hath mockt thee, because hee saide, that thou wert the first inuenter of Musicke: so Gabriell Howligasse was the first inuenter of English Hexameter verses. *Quid respondes?* canst thou brooke it, yea or no?"¹⁴

The allusion to the passage above is clear, and shows that NASHE recognized the apologetic attitude of HARVEY as to the hexameter, and wantonly repeated the charge that he was the inventor of it.

FELIX E. SCHELLING.

University of Pennsylvania.

*FORMS AND PHRASES NOW OBSOLETE, FROM LESSING.**

Vol. 2, page 74. Er mag die übrigen um so viel leichter übergangen sein... Compare with this, page 76, Ich *habe* keinen einzigen übergangen...

" 2, " 113. *Hätte ihm Pope gefolgt...* Compare with this, page 114, der dem Shaftesbury gleichwohl soll *gefolgt sein*.

" 5, " 71. Wenn ich von ihm versichere, dass er freilich *nicht weder* die Dreieinigkeit, *noch sonst* eine geöffnete Lehre der Religion geglaubt hat.

" 8, " 11. *das Punkt.*

" 9, " 16. Wenn ein Jüngling darein verfällt, so *zeigt* er (der Fehler) von einem vollen Kopfe... (ch. 24, p. 144).

" 12, " 120. Dass er mehr darin geleistet hat, als tausend andere *nicht würden* geleistet haben.

" 14, " 264. *Der Hyacinth.*

" 19, " 36. Ich will *Sie* zu seiner Bekanntschaft *verhelfen*.

" 19, " 114. *Hat man jemals einem Frauenzimmer... so begegnet?*

" 19, " 130. Der Schade ist *Ihre*.

^{14.} 'Works of Nashe,' ed. GROSART, ii, p. 237.

*LESSING's Werke: Ausgabe in 32 Bänden, Berlin, 1825-1828.

Vol. 19, page 144. Mein halbes Vermögen ist *Ihre*.

" 19, " 194. Christoph (*kommt gelacht*).
" 20, " 5. Wie oft *bin* ich nicht darauf bestanden?

" 20, " 46. Ein Mensch, der *keinen Gott glaubt*.

" 20, " 135. Bin ich seitdem von der Pest befallen worden, *als* ich Sie nicht gesehen habe?

" 21, " 175. Ich weiss weiter nichts, als dass Du und mein Vater in Krieg verwickelt sind.

" 21, " 182. *Das Schrecken.*

" 21, " 191. Der denkende Künstler ist noch eins so werth.

" 21, " 211. Sie *sollte* nicht allein *gegangen sein* (=hätte nicht allein gehen sollen).

" 21, " 218. Du *hättest* mir das sogleich *sollen* gemeldet haben.

" 23, " 89. Der zwölften Monden droht zu verfliessen.—Erst der zwölften Monden?

" 23, " 185. Durch die Affecten.

" 23, " 191. Jeder Person Charakter Affecten und Gedanken...

" 23, " 207. Die *obscönen* Gedanken.

" 24, " 47. Diesen Gecken zu sehen, ist *ekelhafter* als lächerlich.

" 24, " 64. Einen Perioden.

" 24, " 77. Scenen... die uns aus Herzensgrunde zu lachen machen.

" 24, " 77. *Frostiger*, als lächerlich.

" 24, " 83. *Rhetorischer* als gründlich.

" 24, " 109. Sein Ausdruck ist nur öfters ein wenig zu gesucht und kostbar ("précieux").

" 24, " 377. Wer es zuerst spielen gesehen.

" 25, " 308. Keiner von beiden hat *das vierte* Theil so viel Stücke gemacht. Compare with this, page 316, Desto weniger lässt sich *der geringste* Theil verändern.

" 25, " 318. Dieser Aeschinus, *den er* ein so liederliches Leben zu führen glaubt, ist noch immer sein Sohn.

Vol. 25, page 340. *Der Zeug ist schon verschnitten.*
 " 26, " 64. . . dass Sie kein Metaphysiker Sein können, ohne dass ich *nicht* auch einer sei.
 " 26, " 176. . . und suche ihre Einbildungskraft durch mehr sinnliche Bilder zu erhitzen, als freilich . . . *nicht* nöthig wären.

A. LODEMAN.

Michigan State Normal School.

The Poetry of Tennyson. By HENRY VAN DYKE. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1889. 8vo, pp. xiii, 296.

In these days when TENNYSON gets placed as a "Poet of Two Poems" by an English magazine critic, and when TENNYSON's poetry is patronizingly alluded to by another critic as merely the fluent and cheerful rhythmic utterance of the notion of the hour, it is worth our while to at least consider what so able a writer as Dr. VAN DYKE has to say in support of the rather startling proposition that TENNYSON ranks third in the list of England's great poets. For, though the ranking of poets does not advance us much, the study of the really excellent in poetry, when made by an earnest reader, cannot be other than an aid to students. Such study, in exactly a line that is useful, is recorded in these essays.

They are not, says Dr. VAN DYKE, to be considered as critical essays, and I am quite sure that their appeal is certainly not to the "mere scholar," the sort of person whom Professor CORSON so fearlessly and amusingly castigates in his recently issued Shakespearian studies. For such scholar numerous hints of study indeed are given: at the end is to be found a list of correspondences with the Bible, and also a list of editions and of works relating to the criticism of TENNYSON, this last in chronological form, but spoken of in the preface as a bibliography. This list is most neatly arranged and is useful as a chronological table. But I am sorry that Dr. VAN DYKE speaks of it as he does in his preface (p. vii), as a "bibliography more complete than any

that has yet been published," for it is, in fact, so incomplete that it is hardly a bibliography at all. The American editions are not chronicled, though some of them have been mentioned in the text; the studies of the poems made by German scholars are wholly neglected; and of the reviews and criticisms made by American and English writers, while POOLE'S 'Index' gives two hundred and ninety-three entries, this list has, if I rightly compute, but fifty-three, and the list given is compiled upon no very easily discernible principle, since it omits to mention important papers such as those of GLADSTONE (*Quarterly* cvi, 454), DOWDEN ('Studies in Literature,' 1883), W. H. BROWNE (*Southern Magazine* xii, 106) and HENRY JAMES, JR., (*Nation* xxiv, 43), while it includes some rather trivial utterances.

And yet I say that these essays record a study in exactly a line that is useful, because the essays supply both stimulant and suggestion. There are seven of them. Of these the most important one is, to my thinking, the third, which institutes a comparison between TENNYSON and MILTON, and presents the proposition that "among all poets—certainly among all English poets—TENNYSON's next of kin is MILTON." I cannot think that many will agree with Dr. VAN DYKE's conclusion in this essay. For myself, I am free to say that, admitting everything that is here said, tracing the lines of similarity to their farthest limit in each instance, yet to my view the lines seem to stretch out to a greater distance in the work of the elder poet. I would not take away by one word from that which Dr. VAN DYKE claims for TENNYSON, and yet I find a difference, as of the difference between the neat style and the grand style, between him and MILTON, in respect of manner; and a difference as of the difference between the Sophoclean character and the Æschylean character, in respect of vision. Admitting, I say, all that Dr. VAN DYKE sets forth, three things are certainly suggestive:—the common love of the beautiful, the similar attitude towards nature, the similar tone of high sensuousness. Then there are certain parallelisms—in life-experience, in bent of thought, even in thought-limit—brought out here forcibly. Nevertheless, to many of us, I think, there remains a quality—call it good,

or call it bad, certainly a quality—in MILTON, not found in TENNYSON.

The second important essay in the volume under consideration, is the study of the "Idylls of the King," which is full of suggestion and discriminating interpretation. Dr. VAN DYKE finds the "Idylls" to be, not an allegory, but a parable, in that each story (that is) depicts "not virtue representing a person, but a person embodying and representing a virtue"; and that the poem as a whole brings out in luminous splendor three great truths of human life :—sin as the principle of disintegration and death, the soul as a resistant and conquering power, and the profound truth of the vicarious element in human life. The substitution by TENNYSON of Christian nemesis and Christian redemption for the Greek nemesis and the Greek fatalism of MALLORY, befits the modern thought-habit; TENNYSON becomes a creator; and the "Idylls" stands, says Dr. VAN DYKE, as the "most representative poem of the present age." I think one naturally starts up at this last dictum and makes ready to combat, as if a statement somewhat too sweeping had been made; but I have not space for a discussion here. Whether one agrees or does not agree in the conclusion, I think one wishes the discussion had been longer, and especially regrets that Dr. VAN DYKE did not work out the relation of TENNYSON, WAGNER, and VICTOR HUGO as artists describing the tragic history of the soul of man, hinted at in the opening of the essay.

The remaining essays in the volume, all worth consideration though less complete in treatment than the ones to which I have called attention, concern themselves with the early artistic life of TENNYSON; with the artist's mental growth as shown by changes made in diction and substance in successive editions with the "historic trilogy" ("Queen Mary," "Harold," and "Becket"); with the evidences of the influence of the Bible upon TENNYSON's poetry; and with what Dr. VAN DYKE sets down as "two splendid failures"—"Maude" and "The Princess." Altogether, I must consider this a very suggestive book.

FRANCIS H. STODDARD.

University of the City of New York.

Geschichte des Physiologus. Mit zwei Textbeilagen. Von FRIEDRICH LAUCHERT. Strassburg : Karl J. Trübner. 1889. 8vo, pp. xiii, 312.

The Physiologus from the early times of the Christian church down to the later Middle Ages held a place only second to that of the Bible; it was translated into almost every language spoken in Christian lands, and influenced both general literature and Natural History. A history of this remarkable work deserves, therefore, general attention.

LAUCHERT gives first an account of the origin and spread of the Physiologus in Christian antiquity, and then treats of its history during the Middle Ages. To this he adds an edition of the Greek Physiologus based on the Vienna Cod. Theol. 128, and the text of the younger of the two German versions according to the only manuscript known to exist.

The word Physiologus originally signified, not a book of this title, but a person, as is proved, for instance, by the phrase ὁ φυσιολόγος λέγει. It is possible that ARISTOTLE was this naturalist, and that the author of the Physiologus drew most of his information from a pseudo-Aristotelian treatise on animals. Many details correspond to statements found in HERODOTUS, KTESIAS, ARISTOTLE and PLUTARCH, and the agreement with PLINY and ÆLIAN is especially close.

Weighty arguments are adduced to show that the work was composed at Alexandria in the first third of the second century of our era, as JUSTIN MARTYR (†168 A. D.) probably knew it, and ORIGEN quotes it directly. Its author intended it for a popular theological work, which, on the one hand, was to set forth the most important doctrines of Christian faith by means of allegorical interpretations of real or fabulous characteristics of animals, and, on the other hand, was to hold up other characteristics as examples for imitation or as warnings. PITRA's view that the author was a Gnostic is disproved at length, as is also the view still held by KRESSNER that the Physiologus was at first meant for a collection of descriptions of the animals mentioned in the Bible, to which quotations from the

Scriptures and allegorical interpretations were added later. It is shown conclusively that the oldest Syriac Physiologus, and the fragment of a Latin one in the glossary of ANSILEUBUS, quoted in favor of the other opinion, do not represent older stages of development, but, on the contrary, later abridgments. Among the older translations (the Ethiopian, the Armenian, the two Syriac, and those into Latin) the first is most valuable for the reconstruction of the original text, and the last of special importance as being the source of many other versions.

The first mention of a Latin Physiologus is found in the so-called *Decretum Gelasianum* early in the sixth century, but by an acute observation LAUCHERT proves that the oldest Latin version must have been made much earlier. He noticed that in a list of heretics given under the articles "ant" and not occurring in the Greek Physiologus, the name of NESTORIUS is wanting. Accordingly the translation must have been made before 431, when his doctrines were condemned.

The principal Latin version in existence follows the original quite closely in the descriptions of the animals, but has considerably amplified the interpretations. Derived from this version are the so-called 'Dicta Chrysostomi de Naturis Bestiarum,' containing only thirty-two articles, arranged so as to give first the beasts and then the birds, but omitting the stones. It is interesting that the fox here represents not only the devil but also the heretics. Neither the time nor the place of the 'Dicta' can be determined with any degree of certainty. The *terminus ante quem* is the eleventh century, the date of the manuscript.

To the same century belongs unquestionably a metrical version of the Physiologus containing twelve articles. It is connected with the name of a certain THEOBALDUS and was copied more frequently and up to a later date than any of the others. ISIDORUS was used, an article on the spider inserted, and the narrative treated very freely throughout.

Of the other two metrical versions mentioned by THIERFELDER, one is doubted and the other excluded.

We shall not dwell here on the Middle Greek, Slavic and Wallachian Physiologi, or on all the Greek and Latin church-fathers and writers whom LAUCHERT mentions as having known and used the work. It will suffice to call attention to ISIDORUS of Seville, who collected in his great encyclopædia, entitled 'Etimologiae,' not only statements taken directly or indirectly from the Physiologus, but also certain (oftentimes fabulous) characteristics of animals, derived from other sources. As this work of ISIDORUS was studied extensively it influenced a good many composers of Physiologi, or Bestiaries (as they are also called, from dealing chiefly with beasts).

All Germanic and Romance Physiologi are based upon Latin versions. The Germanic are: the Anglo-Saxon, of the ninth or possibly even the eighth century, two Old High German versions, of the eleventh and twelfth centuries (the latter of which is a close approach to Middle High German), the Icelandic, and the East Anglian of the thirteenth century.

The fragment of the Anglo-Saxon (a metrical) Version, contains articles on only two animals complete, together with a portion of a third. LAUCHERT thinks the identification of the third animal is not beyond suspicion, and is inclined to believe that the translation was limited to the three.

The two German versions, the one a fragment, the other complete with twenty-nine articles, are closely akin to the 'Dicta Chrysostomi.' The East-Anglian, again a metrical version, includes the twelve animals of the metrical Physiologus of THEOBALD, to which is added the dove, probably taken from ALEXANDER NECKAM. The writer must also have been familiar with the complete Physiologus.

The Romance Physiologi are the Anglo-Norman of PHILIPPE DE THAUN in verse (soon after 1121), that of PIERRE LE PICARD (beginning of the thirteenth century), that of the cleric GUILLAUME DE NORMANDIE, again in verse (about 1210), a Waldensian version, not published up to 1888, some extracts in Provençal, and fragments of a Spanish version. PHILIPPE DE THAUN has taken more liberties with the original than any of his predecessors. The "Bestiaire" and the "Physiologus" quoted

by him must be identical. His additions are mainly from ISIDORUS. Concerning PIERRE LE PICARD's work, which exists in a simple and in a more amplified form, LAUCHERT holds, against CAHIER, that the latter is based upon the former and that the additions also are as old as the thirteenth century. New animals were introduced. ISIDORUS is again one of the chief sources.

GUILLAUME DE NORMANDIE has fewer additions than PHILIPPE and PIERRE. He too uses ISIDORUS. The interpretations are homiletical in character and are less dry than those in PHILIPPE. PHILLIPPE calls the fox "gulpils" only, while the other texts use "renart" also.

The Waldensian work is entitled, "De las proprietas de las animanças." The author JACO declares in his introduction that it is his purpose to write a text-book for instruction, and this is the reason why in his work still less of the old Physiologus is left than in the French Bestiaries just mentioned.

The title of the Provençal extracts, published in BARTSCH, 'Chrestomathie Provençale,' is: "Aiso son las naturas d'alcus auzels e d'al-cunas bestias." As for the Spanish fragments it has escaped LAUCHERT's attention that the 'Libro de los gatos' (p. 300), which among its many tales has but three from the Physiologus, is merely a translation from the fables of ODO DE CERITONA.

Space does not permit us to follow LAUCHERT at length in the interesting discussions which make up the last third of his book. He first treats of the allegories of the Physiologus and traces them through the older ecclesiastical literature, the court-poetry of the thirteenth century, the Minnesingers, as applied to chivalry or with reference to service to feudal lords, and, again, when no special reference can be pointed out. Then the symbolism of the work as shown in Christian art is taken up, and the writer concludes with outlining the influence the Physiologus has exerted upon the literature of the last centuries down to our own day.

We shall not attempt here to give a list of the few misprints and wrong references, which the reader can verify for himself with very little trouble, nor do we lay much stress upon the omission of two references to 'Reincke de Vos' (Prien v. 3353 ff. and 4955 ff.) which

might have been given, but we are surprised that no mention is made of the 'Ecbasis' and miss a discussion (which might have been brief) of the relation of the Physiologus to the Animal Epics.

The 'Ecbasis cuiusdam captivi per tropologiam,' composed about 940 near Toul by a German monk, shows more traces of the influence of the Physiologus and of ISIDORUS than any other Animal Epic. This is shown by the character and position of the panther and the leopard, by the deformity attributed to the monkey, by the somewhat haughty intelligence of the hedgehog, by the introduction of the Fulica, and by other traits.

As to the influence of the Physiologus on the development of the Animal Epics in general, VOIGT, the editor of the 'Ecbasis' and 'Ysengrimus,' who treats of this question 'Ecb.,' pp. 56 ff. and 'Yseng.,' pp. lxxxviii ff., seems to make it somewhat too prominent. In fact, the story of the fox feigning death in order to catch birds, is the only one that was adopted by the majority of the Epics; as for the other cases in which the fox or any other animal feigns death, KOLMATSCHEVSKIJ has rightly observed that so common a device need not have been borrowed from the Physiologus. For upon the whole the Physiologus and the Animal Epics are utterly different in character. The former describes qualities of animals, the latter tell actions. In the Physiologus the animals are mere vehicles of religious teachings, admonitions or warnings; in the Epics they are the heroes, and their doings and sufferings interest us and appeal to our sympathy apart from implied or possible applications to human life. Only in the beginning and at the end of the Epic literature, in the tenth and in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, does the allegorical character predominate and consequently more numerous traces of the influence of the Physiologus are found. In the best period the material for the Epics is furnished almost solely by Æsopic fables, Eastern stories, monkish productions, and, above all, by European folk-tales.

The few errors or omissions noticed do not detract materially from the usefulness of LAUCHERT's work.

A. GERBER.

Earlham College.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE PHONETIC SECTION.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—During the month of August the Secretary sent a circular to some of those members of the Modern Language Association who, as he thought, were likely to be interested in phonetics; many, however, he was unable to reach, the revised membership list not having appeared at that time. All persons who have the least interest in the study of pronunciation, whether they be members of the Association or not, are now urged to make investigations in one or more of the directions indicated below, and to communicate the results to the Secretary before the middle of December. Several valuable contributions have already been promised.

1. *For persons who have but little time to spare (no knowledge of phonetics required).*—See the diagrams of tongue and lip positions just issued in the *Publications* of the M. L. A., and compare them by eye with your own mode of uttering the vowels, noting carefully any differences. In studying your lip positions, be sure to pronounce the vowels in a perfectly unaffected manner; and when examining the tongue, increase the natural mouth aperture only as much as is necessary to obtain a view. Notice particularly ð, Ȣ, a, u, Ȣ.

2. *For persons who are willing to spend some time in useful and interesting original research (no previous knowledge of phonetics required).*—Measure as many as possible of your own vowels according to some accurate method.* Any work of this kind, especially if done by a foreigner, or by several Americans whose dialects differ considerably, will be of great value. If your time is limited, restrict yourself to one vowel, preferably ð, Ȣ, a, u, or Ȣ, if you are an English-speaking person; ð, Ȣ, a, or e in *gabe*, if you are a German; Ȣ in *pâte*, a in *patte*, o in *bonne*, e in *me*, or a nasal vowel, if you are a Frenchman.

3. *For persons who have some acquaintance with phonetics.*—Write in your own natural pronunciation the sentences in SWEET's 'Elementarbuch des gesprochenen English,' para-

*See article on "Vowel Measurements" (*Publications* of the M. L. A.) and, if possible, some more important work on phonetics.

graph 38 (pp. 16 and 17 of the 1st edition, p. 94 of the 2d), noting accent, inflection, and stress-groups, and using either SWEET's alphabet or that of the American Dialect Society (state which one you use).

In connection with the results of experiments upon yourself, please state your parentage, birthplace, places of residences, and any circumstances that may have affected your pronunciation. When describing any sound, give several words in which it occurs.

Any other original observations on the formation of vowels or consonants, and any further attempts at phonetic transcription will be gratefully received.

If you are sufficiently interested in the work of the Section, you are invited to become a member by contributing one dollar toward defraying expenses of postage and printing.

C. H. GRANDGENT,
Secretary.

.19 Wendell St., Cambridge, Mass.

CL>I IN JERSEY-FRENCH.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Referring to Dr. MATZKE's article on *cl>i* (MOD. LANG. NOTES v, pp. 177-179), the following notes may be added to what is there stated:—In the Jersey-French dialect of to-day we have for *i* in the combinations *cl*, *gl*, *bl*, *fl*, *pl*, three distinct pronunciations existing side by side and used interchangeably over the whole island; viz., *i*, *Ȣ*, *j*. These developments hold good alike for initial and medial position, e. g. (a) Initial:—CLARU>*kȢe*, *kȢe*, *kje*; GLOBU>*gȢob*, *gȢob*, *gjob*; BLANCA>*bȢas*, *bȢas*, *bȢas*; FLORE>*fȢo*, *fȢo*, *ffȢo*; PLUMA>*pȢom*, *pȢom*, *pȢom*; (b) medial:—CIRC'LU>*sȢrkȢe*, etc.; REG'LA>*regȢe*, etc.; TAB'LA>*tabȢe*, etc.; SUPPLATU>*supȢe*, etc.; COMPLETU>*kȢpȢe*, etc.

J. S. SHEFLOE.
Woman's College of Baltimore.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Will some reader of the MOD. LANG. NOTES kindly inform me where I can find in this country the Spanish Chronicle of ALAYA, 'Grandezas de España,' which is mentioned in BIRÉ, 'V. Hugo avant 1830,' p. 490?

JOHN E. MATZKE.
Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.

ERRATA.

April, 1890 (vol. v, no 4 of MOD. LANG. NOTES),
 Col. 219, v. 309, for 15 read 13.
 v. 311, for 16 read 15.
 Col. 220, v. 336, for *seint* read *seint*.
 Col. 221, v. 437, for *vendom* read *vendrom*.

BRIEF MENTION.

The eighth number of 'Erlanger Beiträge zur englischen Philologie,' hrsg. von H. Varnhagen, is a tabulation of proverbial sayings in the works of CHAUCER: "Das Sprichwort bei Chaucer. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Sprichwörterkunde. Von WILLI HAECKEL." If CHAUCER'S "saying" is found, or corresponds to anything, in the principal collections of proverbs compiled for English and for European languages, reference is made to these collections. In the arrangement of the material three principal divisions are made: I, "Sichere Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten; II, Zweifelhafte Sprichwörter, etc.; III, Anspielungen auf Sprichwörter," etc. The subdivision of the first general chapter will further indicate the author's method: "A. 1. Solche welche Gemeingut mehrerer Sprache sind; B. solche welche anderweitig nicht belegt sind, aber von Chaucer ausdrücklich als Sprichwörter bezeichnet werden." Under A. 1. the "sayings" relate to "1. Liebe, Freundschaft; 2. Glück, Un Glück, stetiger Wechsel im Geschick des Menschen; 3. Armut, Reichtum; 4. Geiz, Begehrlichkeit; 5. Müssiggang, Arbeit; 6. Fleiss, Beharrlichkeit, Geduld; 7. Reden, Schweigen; 8. Thorheit, Weisheit; 9. Erfahrung, Vorsicht, Klugheit, Vernunft; 10. Entschlossenheit, Eile, Weile, Mass; 11. Rat, Urteil; 12. Zwang, Notwendigkeit; 13. Gleichheit, Ähnlichkeit, Verschiedenheit; 14. Wahrheit, Aufrichtigkeit; 15. Lüge, Täuschung, Betrug; 16. Sünde, Verbrechen; 17. Vergänglichkeit, Leben, Tod; 18. Ehe; 19. Sprichwörtliche Redensarten, welche keiner der erwähnten Kategorieen angehören." The author has accomplished a task for which all students of CHAUCER will be grateful. If slight omissions are discovered CHAUCER may himself plead extenuation:

"No man at the fyriste stroke
 Ne maye nat fele downe an oke."

'Pure Saxon English, or Americans to the front,' by ELIAS MOLEE, author of 'A Plea for an American Language' (Chicago and New York: Rand, McNally & Co., 1890) is the work of a "philanthropically inclined" man who has "been pondering, for the last twenty-five years, over the idea how we might work up into a true, beautiful, and good language." He offers a solution of the difficult problem of radically undoing the history of the language, by venturing a curious manipulation of "the precious Saxon element"—"for the rest is only brought in by oppression, cruelty and pedantry." In a word a new language is constructed—such as never existed indeed, and (the author will pardon the assurance) such as never can exist. It is another World-Language—one of those Volapük-Pasilingua-Kosmos creations. The book is a marvel of misdirected industry and good-will. Let it be read in charity by those who choose to read it, while the author may reflect on a profound truth to which FELIX DAHN has given the following expression: "Es giebt nicht, gab nie und wird nie geben eine allgemeine abstracte Menschheitssprache oder eine allgemein menschliche Kunst: sondern die Potenz der Sprache, die Auffassung des Schönen wird überall verwirklicht in einer nationalen und geschichtlich bedingten Färbung." In spite of the author's attempt to build upon the primitive national basis of the language, he commits, just as surely as his associates in the craft of language-making, those arbitrary and unlawful acts which can never call a language into being. The world-language advocates may with safety appropriate the words of Jarvis ("The Good-natured Man"): "This same philosophy is a good horse in the stable, but an arrant jade on a journey," but in all seriousness it will be agreed that it isn't even "a good horse in the stable."

The publishers of 'Webster's Unabridged Dictionary' (Messrs. G. & C. Merriam & Co., Springfield, Mass.) have now ready for distribution a new and revised edition of that work with a new and appropriate title: 'Webster's International Dictionary.' In a subsequent issue of this journal a more extended notice of this important work will be given; for the present it may be sufficient to allow the publishers to make the following statements:—

The "International" is, in fact, the popular "Unabridged" thoroughly re-edited in every detail, and vastly enriched in every part, with the purpose of adapting it to meet the larger and severer requirements of another generation as satisfactorily as the "Unabridged" as revised in 1864* and enlarged in '79 and '84 has met the requirements of the last generation. The editing has been done under the supervision of the same editor-in-chief, and under the auspices of the same publishers, who conducted the previous revision. They have never wavered from their aim to maintain its progressive supremacy. They began this revision, not as a speculative venture, but as a duty to scholars and to letters, before the signal of new rivalries was sounded. They have carried it patiently and suitably through to an unforced completion. They have not been obliged to omit any approved excellence of older editions on account of the vested rights of others; nor, on the other hand, have they been compelled to experiment in novelties in order to attract attention. Their labor has been directed to perfecting what was already acknowledged by eminent scholars to be the best. With what liberal expenditure of time and toil and money this duty to scholarship and to the public has been performed, partly appears in the following statements:—Work having direct specific reference to the publication of this Dictionary has been in progress for over ten years. Not less than one hundred paid editorial laborers have been engaged upon it. Besides these, a large number of interested scholars have freely contributed in important ways to its completeness and value. Within the ten years that the work has been in progress, and before the first copy was printed, more than three hundred thousand dollars were expended in editing, illustrating, typesetting and electrotyping. These facts are presented as an assurance, which under existing condition is due to the public, that Webster's International Dictionary is the rightful heir to the pre-eminent favor which for more than half a century has been given to the great work of Noah Webster and its successive revised editions. The retail list price of the new book in rich and substantial sheep binding is \$10.00. It is also supplied in a variety of more expensive bindings.

The publisher E. J. Brill of Leiden has distributed specimen pages of a new edition of Old Saxon Texts, edited by Prof. J. H. GALÉE (University of Utrecht). The work will constitute a large folio volume with numerous phototypes, and will be supplied to subscribers at the cost of £1. 15 sh. Prof. GALÉE is wide-

*Still covered by copyright.

ly known for his profound scholarship, and has made valuable contributions to our knowledge of minor texts of Old Saxon. He has, moreover, almost ready for publication an Old Saxon Grammar. The new and handsome volume of texts will be a complete Corpus of all the known Old Saxon monuments, including the entire "Heljand." In addition to certain phototype pages of the Heljand MSS., the minor texts will in each case be thus reproduced in full, and transliterated. All the MSS. will be described; paleographical peculiarities will be pointed out; variations of dialect will be set forth; and "the whole will be accompanied by an essay on the condition of the Church in Saxon countries, and on the extent of literary studies in those times, i. e., down to the end of the eleventh century." It is hoped that American scholars may promptly give their support to this commendable enterprise.

The secretary of the American Dialect Society has published *Dialect Notes*, Part ii, which embraces pp. 33-83 of the annual volume. The first article in this instalment is by Prof. E. S. SHELDON, the Secretary (Harvard University), in which the writer aims by discussion and by the aid of word-lists "to show some of the differences between the colloquial English of London, as represented in the second edition of Sweet's 'Elementarbuch des gesprochenen English,'" and his own pronunciation. This contribution should be compared with Mr. EMERSON's observations printed in the present number of MOD. LANG. NOTES. Mr. A. F. CHAMBERLAIN contributes "Dialect Research in Canada." Prof. PRIMER, in "Miscellanies," points to some of the guiding principles to be observed in the study of local peculiarities of speech. After these articles follow a number of interesting Word-lists: "Notes from Cincinnati"; "Kentucky Words and Phrases"; "Notes from Louisiana"; "Various Contributions"; "Additions and Corrections to the words mentioned in Part I." The number closes with a revision of Mr. GILBERT M. TUCKER'S "Bibliography of Works on Americanisms."

'Hints on French Syntax with Exercises,' by F. STORR, is the title of a collection of

many of the most frequent instances of differences between English and French constructions. The text and the exercises are printed separately and the book is interleaved for the further convenience of the instructor. The pamphlet (48 pp.) attests its practical value by having already reached the fifth edition. Boston : D. C. Heath & Co.

The second series of the Édition Berlitz (New York; Boston : Schoenhof) is entitled 'Nouvelles.' Many of the most entertaining stories of contemporaneous authors are found in the twelve numbers issued, and not a few poems are scattered through them. DAUDET is represented by that charming *genre* sketch, "Les Vieux," JACQUES NORMAND by "Le Rapide de P. L. M.," JEANNE MAIRET by "Feuilles d'automme," MONSELET by "Une Scène à l'Hôtel Druot," COPPÉE by "Le Morceau de pain," HENRY GRÉVILLE by "La petite servante russe" and THEURIET by L'Oreiller d'ours.' Among the remaining selections are reminiscences of the Franco-Prussian war, scenes drawn from Parisian society and from theatrical life, *monologues*, *saynètes*, and more serious (though, we must confess, less attractive) attempts, as a version of the chronicle of the fourteenth century, "Le Combat des Trente." Among the authors we note SARCEV, MÉRY, H. LAFONTAINE, CHAVETTE and DREYFUS. With but few exceptions the series is made up of those short, sparkling and airy products of the essence of French wit which gives the lighter literature of France its zest and its attractiveness. Their publication in this country renders them accessible to class use and cannot fail to furnish a most pleasing variation in the average curriculum. Price 25 cts. per number; 12 numbers per year.

PERSONAL.

EDWARD EVERETT HALE, JR. (A. B., Harvard University, 1883), has resigned from his position in Cornell University and is at present in Europe, where he has planned to spend several years in the prosecution of studies in Germanic philology, chiefly under Professors KLUGE and SIEVERS in Germany, but also giving some time to the study of English litera-

ture in England. In the latter part of his undergraduate course Mr. HALE turned his attention to historical subjects, and devoted the three years following his graduation to special studies in American history—taking graduate work in connection with the Harris Fellowship at Harvard during a portion of that time, as well as editing LECHFORD's 'Note-book' for the American Antiquarian Society and assisting his father, Dr. EDWARD EVERETT HALE, in the production of 'Franklin in France' (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vols. ii, p. 94 and iv, p. 94). From 1886 to 1889 Mr. HALE was Instructor in English at Cornell University, and, in 1889-'90, as Acting Assistant Professor of English, had charge there of the literary part of Professor CORSON's work, during the latter's absence in Europe.

Dr. SYLVESTER PRIMER (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. iv, p. 227) has been called to the chair of modern languages in Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Col.

Dr. PHILIPPE B. MARCOU (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. iv, p. 226), has accepted an Instructorship for French in Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.

Prof. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. iv, p. 31), has been appointed Prof. of Modern Languages in the State University of South Dakota, Vermillion, S. Dak. He is at present engaged on a Gothic Hand-book which will contain, besides a short grammar, text and vocabulary, a succinct history of the Goths, including their literature and the position of their language in the Indo-European group of languages, together with a special treatment of phonology, etc. The work will be published by D. C. Heath & Co., Boston.

Mr. C. CARROLL MARDEN has been appointed Instructor in French at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. Mr. MARDEN received the B. A. degree at the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, in June 1889, after which he was engaged as teacher of modern languages in the Norfolk Academy, Norfolk, Va., until he entered upon his present position.

Dr. JOSEPH S. SHEFLOE has been appointed Associate in French at the Woman's College,

Baltimore. Mr. SHEFLOE received the degree of B. A. at Luther College, Decorah, Iowa, in 1885, and that of A. M. in 1889; in June of the present year, he won the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the Johns Hopkins University, presenting a thesis on the French Dialect of Jersey, Channel Islands.

Mr. J. D. BRUNNER (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. iv, p. 258) has been appointed Instructor in Modern Languages at Mr. GEORGE CAREY'S School for Boys, Baltimore. Mr. BRUNNER purposes to enter upon a course of special study in the Romance Languages at the Johns Hopkins University.

Mr. GLEN L. SWIGGETT has been appointed Instructor in Modern Languages at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. Mr. SWIGGETT received the B. A. degree at the University of Indiana in 1888; a part of the following academic year was passed as graduate student at his Alma Mater and in 1889-90 he continued graduate studies in the Germanic and Romance departments of the Johns Hopkins University.

Mr. T. HOLLIDAY HICKS, has been appointed Assistant Professor of English and History at St. John's College (Annapolis, Md.) where he received the B. A. degree in 1887. Immediately after graduation he was made Instructor in the preparatory Department of his Alma Mater, which post he held up to his recent promotion.

Dr. MORGAN CALLAWAY, JR., has been called from the Southwestern University at Georgetown, Texas (*vid. MOD. LANG. NOTES* vol. iv, p. 226), to an Assistant Professorship in English at the University of Texas (Austin, Texas). The English chair at Georgetown will be occupied by Mr. CHARLES HUNTER ROSS of Auburn, Ala., who has during the past two years (holding a fellowship for one of these years) pursued advanced courses in English at the Johns Hopkins University.

Mr. H. J. DARNALL, after serving the University of Tennessee for one year as Assistant in English, is now "Professor of English and Modern Languages" at the Missouri Military Academy, Mexico, Mo. Mr. DARNALL's college course was divided between the University of North Carolina and the Washington and Lee University.

Dr. EDWARD M. BROWN succeeds Professor HART in the chair of "Modern Languages and Literature" at the University of Cincinnati. For the earlier portion of Dr. BROWN's

career see MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. v, p. 29; during the past summer, on his return to Göttingen, he passed his examination for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, presenting a dissertation entitled: "Die Sprache der Rushworth Glossen zum Evangelium Mattheus, und der mercische Dialekt."

Dr. GEORGE A. HENCH has been called to the University of Michigan as Instructor in German. Dr. HENCH, a graduate of Lafayette College, received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy a year ago at the Johns Hopkins University. During the past year he attended the Universities of Heidelberg and Berlin, and published his dissertation on the O. H. G. "Monsee Fragments" (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. iv, p. 266). He has now in press (Trübner, Strassburg) a comprehensive edition of the "Fragments," and is preparing an edition, with complete phototypes of the MS., of the O. H. G. version of ISIDORE's treatise "De Fide Catholica contra Judaeos."

OBITUARY.

The death of Dr. FREDERICK H. HEDGE, which occurred at Cambridge on Aug. 20, recalls once more the fact that Harvard University was the first institution in this country to grant to German literature a place among its regular courses of instruction. The first professor of the German language and literature at Harvard was KARL FOLLEN, the author of 'Schalle du Freiheitssang,' who in consequence of his implication in the Burschenschaft movement was exiled from Germany and in 1824 found a refuge in this country; a truly remarkable man filled with the spirit of the great age of German literature, an apostle of German idealism and independence. Dr. HEDGE was his worthy successor. He also had imbibed in early youth a deep admiration for the German character, and the most persistent of his scholarly endeavors throughout his life was to arouse enthusiasm for the great representatives of idealism in German thought and literature. From a critical point of view his 'Prose Writers of Germany,' which appeared in four editions from 1849 to 1870, will probably stand out as the most valuable of his contributions to the literary history of Germany. His 'Hours with German Classics,' a collection of lectures originally delivered at Harvard University and published in book form in 1886, delightful as are some of its chapters, is marred by inadequate knowledge of recent literary and philological research. Dr. HEDGE's figure will forever stand at the beginning of a new era in the history of modern language study in this country, inspiring and venerable even to those who have absorbed and mastered most of the ideas which he spent a life time in upholding and interpreting.

JOURNAL NOTICES.

ANGLIA, VOL. XIII, PART I:—**Stevers, E.**, Zu Cynewulf.—**Logeman, H.**, New Aldhelm Glosses.—**Koeppe, E.**, Die englischen Tassoübersetzungen des 16. Jahrhunderts.—**Fluegel, E.**, Verschollene Sonette.—**Koeppe, E.**, Sir Thomas Wyatt und Melin de Saint-Gelais.—**Einenkel, E.**, Der Infinitiv im Mittelenglischen.—**Varnhagen, H.**, Die Quelle des Trentalle Sancti Gregorii.—**Stoffel, C.**, Entgegnung zu Anglia XII, 388 ff.—**PART II:** Sarrazin, G., Die Entstehung der Hamlettragödie.—**Telzmann, E.**, Zur Stabreimzeile in William Langland's Buch von Peter dem Pflüger.—**Koeppe, E.**, Chauceriana.—**Hupe, H.**, Havelok-Studien.—**Balg, H.**, Entgegnung.—**Hofer, O.**, Entgegnung.—**Pabst, F.**, Flexionsverhältnisse bei Robert von Gloucester.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, VOL. XIV, PART 2: Kaluza, M., Kleinere Publicationen aus me. Handschriften.—**Swoboda, W.**, Die Methode Toussaint-Langenscheidt.—**Reviews:** Schröer, A., Benedictinerregel; Logeman, H., The Rule of St. Benet (A. Schröer).—Hoeser, J., Die syntactischen erschleunigungen in Be Domes Dage (E. Nader).—Koenig, G., Der Vers in Shakespeare's Dramen (A. Schröer).—Timon, Dr., Shakespeare's Drama in seiner natürlichen Entwicklung dargestellt (E. J. Brill).—Philips, Carl, Lokalführung in Shakespeare's Dramen (Max Koch).—Raymond, G. L., Poetry as a representative art (Max Koch).—Nagel, H., Sir Thomas Wyatt and Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (E. Koeppe).—Tuerck, H., Hamlet ein Genie (Felix Bobertag).—Staake, Paul, A critical introduction to Sir Walter Scott's "Lay of the last minstrel" (Max Koch).—Hartmann, H., Über die Vorlagen zu Sheridans "Rivals" (L. Proescholdt).—Hoene, Die Sprache des neueren engl. Romans und der Tagespresse (M. Krummacher).—Western, A., Engelsk Grammatik; Engelsk Elementarbok (H. Klinghardt).—Wagner, Ph., Lehrbuch der Engl. Sprache (F. Beyer).—Vietor, W., Phonetische Studien (H. Klinghardt).—Passy, Paul, Elémans d'Anglais parlé (A. Klinghardt).—Swoboda, W., Englische Leselehre (E. Nader).—Miscellen: Krummacher, M., Zu Lord Stanhope's History of England.—Ackermann, R., Die Shelley Society und ihre Publicationen.—Sprenger, R., Zwei alte Textfehler in Goldsmith's "Vicar of Wakefield."—Lauchert, F., Zu Mann's recension meiner "Geschichte des Physiologus."—Mann, M. F., Schlusskuserungen.

POET-LORE. May, June, July, August: Fleay, F. G., The story of Shelley's Life in his "Epipsychidion."—Brinton, B. G., The new poetic form as shown in Browning.—Jastrow, M. Jr., An Arabic version of Macbeth's "moving wood."—Brown, Anna B., The fall of the angels: Cædmon.—Morley, George, Shakespeare Commemorations.—Griffiths, L. M., Marston's Shakespearianisms.—Williams, F. H., Browning's form.—Robertson, Alice Kent, The tragic motife "in a balcony."—Wurtzburg, C. A., The "Alkestis" of Euripides and of Browning.—Trumbull, J., Walt Whitman's view of Shakespeare.—Brown, Anna B., The dream of the holy rood: Cædmon.—Elmendorf, Maria L., A recent renaissance. I, Roumanille and Mistral.—Korner, Sinclair, Shakespeare's inheritance from

the fourteenth century.—Griffiths, L. M., "Antonio's revenge" and "Hamlet."—Anderson, Jesse M., Humor; Carlyle and Browning.—Norris, J. Parker, The first American editor of Shakespeare.

ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIEN DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN UND LITTERATURN. LXXXIV. BAND, 4 HEFT.—Leitzmann, Albert, I. Beiträge zur Kenntnis Georg Forsters aus ungedruckten Quellen.—Koeppe, Emil, Chaucer und Innocenz des Dritten Traktat De Contemptu Mundi sive De Misericordia Humanae.—Speyer, Otto, Manzonis Graf von Carmagnola und seine Kritiker.—Beurteilungen und kurze Anzeigen.—Voelckerling, G., Englische Parlamentsreden zur französischen Revolution, herausgegeben und erklärt von Dr. Perle.—Zupitza, Julius, Campbell, Gertrude of Wyoming. A Pennsylvanian Tale. Edited with Introduction and Notes by H. Macaulay Fitzgibbon.—Voelckerling, G., The Sketchbook von Washington Irving. Erster Band.—Zupitza, Julius, The Bell of St. Paul's by Walter Besant.—Zupitza, Julius, Blind Justice and "Who, being Dead, yet speaketh." By Helen Mathers (Mrs. Henry Reeves).—Zupitza, Julius, Mount Eden: A Romance By Florence Marryat.—T., A., Pio Rajna, Le Corti d'Amore.—T., A., H. A. Schoetensack, Französisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch. Erste und zweite Abteilung.—Bachmann, Fr., Dr. O. Ulrich: 1) Elementarbuch der französischen Sprache für höhere Lehranstalten. 2) Schulgrammatik der französischen Sprache für höhere Lehranstalten. 3) Übungsbuch zum Übersetzen aus dem Deutschen in das Französische für die mittleren und oberen Klassen höherer Lehranstalten.—Bachmann, Fr., Lehr- und Lesebuch der französischen Sprache von Dr. Eugene Wolter.—Bachmann, Fr., Französisches Lesebuch. Erster Teil, für Quarta, Unter- und Obertertia der Gymnasien u. s. w. Mit einem Wörterbuch. Von Dr. Karl Meurer.—Bachmann, Fr., Französisches Lesebuch für die unteren und mittleren Klassen der Gymnasien und höheren Bürgerschulen. Mit einem ausführlichen erklärenden Wörterbuch von Dr. L. Süpte.—Mueller, Ad., R. Wilcke, Materialien zum Übersetzen aus dem Deutschen ins Französische.—Bachmann, Fr., Französische Briefe, zum Rückübersetzen aus dem Deutschen ins Französische bearbeitet von H. Breitinger.—Schulze, Alfred, Dr. Emil Seelman, Bibliographie des altfranzösischen Rolandsliedes mit Berücksichtigung nahestehender Sprach- und Litteraturdenkmale.

REVUE DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT DES LANGUES VIVANTES. 7e Année. JUILLET, 1890. NO. 5.—D., Le Certificat d'Aptitude et les Candidats de Province.—Seigneur, Ch., Questions d'Enseignement secondaire.—Fautrie, Mac, Comus. Traduction et commentaire (suite).—Eglin, C., Etude sur le genre des substantifs en allemand.—Varia.—Revue des Cours et Conférences. Faculté des Lettres de Paris. Résumé des cours. Agrégation (Allemand et Anglais). Leçons.—Certificats d'aptitude (Allemand et Anglais). Leçons de grammaire. Questions sur l'histoire de la littérature.—Concours de 1890. Agrégation et Certificat d'Aptitude (Allemand et Anglais). Epreuves écrites.—Certificat d'aptitude (Allemand et Anglais) de l'Enseignement primaire. Epreuves écrites. Liste des admissibles.—Bibliographie.—Documents officiels.